DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 582 SP 003 431

AUTHOR	Fox, David J.; And Others
TITLE	Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers (STINT). Part I.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Sep 69
NOTE	140p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.10
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teachers, *Inservice Teacher Education, Master Teachers, Teacher Educators, *Teacher Orientation, Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

This document is an evaluative description of the program conducted by the New York City Board of Education during the 1968-69 school year. Opening chapters describe the two-phase evaluation design (descriptive and qualitative) and outline the program in which an initial group of 152 master teachers plus 100 more added in Febraury were assigned as teacher trainers to 229 schools where each worked with a maximum number of nine new teachers, providing demonstration lessons, assisting cooperative planning, advising on implementing curriculum, guiding in disciplinary procedures, and helping to establish classroom routines. The six chapters presenting results of the evaluative study deal with characteristics and role of the teacher trainer; evaluation of classroom functioning including teacher ratings, teacher-pupil interaction, and teacher characteristics; scope of the program and its overt impact on children and teachers including children's achievement and attendance and teacher attendance; and perceptions of the program by district coordinators and principals and by STINT teacher trainers. Findings are summarized. Conclusions are drawn which indicate that the program was successful, and recommendations for its continuation and expansion are listed. Appendixes include the seven evaluation instruments used (interview guides and questionnaires) and the manual entitled "Guidelines for Teacher Trainers." (JS)

ED035582

Center for Urban Education
Educational Research Committee
State Urban Education Program Evaluation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SUPPORTIVE TRAINING FOR INEXPERIENCED AND NEW TEACHERS (STINT)

PART I

David J. Fox, Audrey Herr,
and Norman Shapiro

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under the New York State Urban Education Program (Chapter 685, Section 9, Subdivision 12, Laws of 1968, New York State Legislature), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York.

September 1969

SP003431

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This evaluation of the Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers (STINT) program was contracted for on March 1, 1969 and the evaluation report was submitted on July 15, 1969. The pressure imposed by these dates determined what was done and, to some extent, what could not be done in this evaluation. Under such difficult circumstances, we were afforded the exemplary cooperation of the staffs of the New York City Board of Education Bureau of Personnel, Bureau of Research and the participating schools.

Clearly the STINT program was one of the most important innovations in the area of teacher training and preparation in recent years, and our recognition of this motivated our accepting an assignment we knew would mean evaluation under great pressure. The Evaluation Chairman acknowledges the professional abilities and dedication of Audrey Herr as Project Director and Norman Shapiro as Research Associate, whose functioning under this pressure made this evaluation possible.

We offer this evaluation as a first, general, rather than a definitive evaluation of the STINT program. We consider it only general because the late start made it impossible for us to use an experimental-control design either for schools or for teachers within schools, and also eliminated any chance for a pre-post design in the administration of data-gathering instruments.

We stress this here in the introduction, to orient the reader to our perception of what we have been able to accomplish, and also to urge that evaluation be built into the STINT program if it is continued for 1969-70, to expedite the designs and analyses which were not possible this first year.

One other effect of the time pressure on the evaluation is that it is being reported in two parts. This report, Part I, is primarily descriptive of the separate components of the evaluation design. The early submission date for the report made it necessary to delay until January 1970 Part II which will contain the depth analysis of the data collected on a school-by-school basis, the analysis across roles, and the interrelationships among the various data-gathering instruments employed. We appreciate Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone making it possible for us to do these additional analyses in a separate report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Evaluation Design 2
Description of the Program 2
Nature of the Program 3

II. PROCEDURES 4

Evaluation Instruments and Sampling Procedures . . . 4
The Interviewers and Observers 7
Selection of Schools and Teachers to Be Observed . . 7
Analysis of Data 9

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEACHER TRAINER 13

Introduction 13
Accepted Applicants 13
Comparison of Rejected and Accepted Applicants . . . 15

IV. THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER TRAINER 17

Source of Data 17
Selection of Trainees 17
Dropping of Trainees 17
Grade Placement of Trainees 18
Ratio of Trainees to Teacher Trainer 18
Materials and Physical Facilities Available
to Teacher Trainers 18
Materials and Physical Facilities Needed 19
Dynamics of the Job 19
Techniques Employed 21
Duties of the Teacher Trainer Outside of STINT . . . 24
Trainers' Evaluation of the Program 24
Overall Evaluation 29

V. THE EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM FUNCTIONING 30

Teacher Ratings 30
Teacher-Pupil Interaction 33
Teacher Characteristics 36

Chapter Page

VI. SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM AND ITS OVERT IMPACT ON CHILDREN AND TEACHERS 38

Scope of the Program 38
Children's Achievement and Attendance 38
Children's Attendance 42
Teacher School Attendance 43

VII. PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM: DISTRICT COORDINATORS AND PRINCIPALS 44

Perceptions of the District Coordinators 44
Perceptions of School Principals 49

VIII. PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM: STINT TEACHER TRAINERS . . . 53

Source of Data 53
Background and Preparation 53
Perceptions of the Teacher Trainer by Trainees . . 53
Self-Appraisal of Teacher Competence and Influence of Teacher Trainer 54
Extent and Quality of Supervision 59
Techniques Employed 59
Effectiveness of Techniques 59
Extent and Quality of Supportive Service 61
Teacher Attitudes 61
Overall Effectiveness 64

IX. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 65

Role of the Teacher Trainer 65
The Evaluation of Classroom Functioning 67
Scope of the Program 68
Children's Achievement 68
Children's Attendance 69
Teacher Attendance 69
Perceptions of the Program 69

X. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 74

APPENDIX A TABLES

APPENDIX B INSTRUMENTS

APPENDIX C STAFF LIST

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

IV-1. Schedule of Activities of Teacher Trainer 20

IV-2. Utilization of Teacher Training Techniques and Effectiveness Ratings by Teacher Trainers in Percent 22

IV-3. Teacher Trainer Perceptions of the Seriousness of the Problems of Their Trainees and the Effectiveness of the Assistance They Provided, in Percent 26

V-1. Summary of Sign Test Performed on ILOR Proportion of Above Average Ratings 31

V-2. Proportion of Above Average Ratings, Teacher Functioning ILOR II, by Sample 34

V-3. Proportion of Above Average Ratings, Teacher-Pupil Interaction, ILOR II, by Sample 35

V-4. Percentage of Above Average Ratings, Teacher Characteristics, ILOR:II, by Sample 37

VI-1. Median and Quartile Grade Equivalents for Children in Fourth Grade Taught by STINT Trainers, Non-STINT Beginning Teachers, and Experienced Teachers in Special Service and Non-Special Service Schools 40

VI-2. Percent of Children Taught by STINT Trainees, Non-STINT Beginning Teachers and Experienced Teachers at Various Grade Level Intervals 41

VII-1. Principals' Evaluation of Teacher Trainers in Their Schools, by Percent 50

VIII-1. Proportions of Above Average Ratings of Self-Appraisals on Aspects of Teaching for STINT Trainers (N=197), Non-STINT Beginning Teachers (N=78), ITTP Graduates (N=75), and Proportions of Trainees Attributing Competence Completely or Considerably to Teacher Trainers 55

Table Page

VIII-2. Utilization of Teacher Training Techniques and Effectiveness Ratings by Trainees in Percent . . . 60

VIII-3. Percent Receiving Continuous Effective Support by Area 62

VIII-4. Percentage of Teachers with Positive Attitudes in Various Aspects 63

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This is an evaluation of the program entitled Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers (STINT) conducted by the Board of Education of the City of New York during the 1968-69 school year. The program was developed in an attempt to meet the orientation and training needs of new and inexperienced teachers assigned to the public elementary schools of the city. Past experience has demonstrated that many potentially valuable teachers become discouraged and leave teaching before giving themselves an opportunity to test their abilities adequately. Frequently, those who remain learn by trial and error on-the-job without benefit of an immediate resource person who could provide direction and concrete assistance based on experience and long exposure to the various situations and problems that are present in the classroom.

To fill this need, an initial group of 152 teachers, considered to be master teachers, were assigned as teacher-trainers to those public school districts throughout the city to which large numbers of new teachers had been appointed at the beginning of the 1968 school year. The district superintendents then assigned these master teachers to schools in which, as of September 1968, there were a substantial number of new and inexperienced teachers and in which there was a history of high teacher turnover. The program was expanded in February to include 100 additional teacher-trainers.

Each teacher-trainer was to work with a maximum of nine new teachers in his school, providing demonstration lessons, assisting cooperative planning, advising on implementing curriculum, guiding in disciplinary procedures and helping to establish classroom routines.

The primary objective of these activities was to provide supportive services to new and inexperienced teachers in curriculum, methodology, class control and planning. By giving this on-the-job immediate help when and where it was needed the teacher-trainer would also be providing a success factor for the novice teacher. This was the first large scale effort to provide such help in the school system. Because of the expertise and experiential background of the teacher trainer, it was believed that the new teacher would be able to develop a more sensitive awareness and a more skillful response to the learning and behavioral styles of children attending schools located in the inner-city areas. Lastly, it was specifically indicated in the proposal that the ultimate beneficiaries of the program would be the many thousands of children who were in the classes of the teachers who would be working with the teacher-trainers.

There were 533 schools in the participating districts, of which 229 (43 percent) had teacher trainers assigned to them.

A. EVALUATION DESIGN

The proposal for this evaluation was funded in March 1969, a factor which imposed basic limitations on the design of the evaluation, limiting it to estimating the effects of the program after it was underway. The design, as executed, consists of two phases: a descriptive and a qualitative phase.

The descriptive evaluation identified both trainers and trainees, describing who the participants are and how they were selected. It also included demographic characteristics such as age, sex, experience and educational background for the teacher-trainers. An investigation was made of the two training programs involved (i.e., that for the teacher-trainers and that for the new teachers) as well as the extent to which materials and techniques were adapted or developed for these training programs. This phase also described the extent of the training programs in terms of such characteristics as nature, content and number of sessions, intervals between sessions, provision for interaction, advice and feedback between sessions; and estimated the impact of the introduction of the STINT program into a school on the pre-STINT amount of supervision and orientation ordinarily provided by administrative staff for new teachers. Finally, comparisons were made of the absentee rates of STINT-trainees and non-STINT beginning teachers.

The initial dimension of the qualitative evaluation was a study of the opinions of participants (both trainers and trainees); then, for several other variables noted below, the qualitative evaluation was intended to include the study of three kinds of teachers and their classes: 1. new teachers who received help from the teacher-trainer; 2. other new teachers in these same schools who did not receive help directly from a teacher-trainer but for whom there might have been a positive "spillover" effect; and 3. experienced teachers in STINT schools.[1] It was hoped that data from the second two groups would provide a basis for evaluating the ratings of in-class teaching performance,[2] self-ratings of competence, and the achievement and school attendance of children of the trainees.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

New teachers characteristically request and require some assistance from experienced and skilled school personnel. For a period of time prior to this year, this assistance came mostly from formal and informal contacts within the school, and from an organized effort by district coordinators who served as teacher trainers. It was the practice for teams of ten to fifteen coordinators to go to individual schools, in accordance with the schools' needs, and work with individual teachers on a one-to-one basis for three or four hours at a time. The usual procedure was for a coordinator to plan a lesson with the teacher; the coordinator would then give the lesson with the teacher observing; after which they would discuss the lesson together. New teachers found working with coordinators in this manner extremely helpful.

---

[1] The problem involved in sampling schools other than STINT schools is discussed in Chapter II under Sample Selection.

[2] Comparison data on these ratings were also available from the 1968 evaluation of the Intensive Teacher Training Program (ITTP) where the same instrument was used to rate the in-class performance of new teachers as was used in the STINT evaluation. See David J. Fox and Audrey Herr, "Intensive Teacher Training Program, 1967-68," The Center for Urban Education, December 1968.

As a result of the coordinators' success, and requests made to the Board of Education by new teachers, district coordinators, and supervisors, the teacher training program (STINT) was developed, submitted to the New York State Urban Teacher Corps, and funded in June 1968.

C. NATURE OF THE PROGRAM

A detailed description of the selection of teacher trainers, the allocation of positions, the training and supervision of the teacher trainers, as well as the job analysis and programming of the teacher trainers, and techniques in training teachers were available in the manual entitled, Guidelines for the Teacher Trainer. (See Appendix A.) The implementation of the program will be discussed in succeeding chapters.

It should be noted here that although the program was funded too late to carry out the planned pre-service training of teacher trainers for the 1968-69 STINT program, a state funded project for the "In-service Education of Teacher Trainers" was conducted for ten consecutive Saturdays beginning April 1968. The meetings were of three hours duration each, and were held in a centrally located high school. There were thirty teacher trainers and district coordinators participating in each of the five groups in the project. All participants received stipends of $9.00 per session, and attended two consecutive sessions. The essence of the meetings was: sharing problems and solutions; curriculum workshops; lesson planning; and preparing materials for new teachers.

In anticipation of the 1969-70 school year, plans have been made for the pre-service orientation and training of new and additional teacher trainers.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES

A. EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS AND SAMPLING PROCEDURES

Data for this evaluation were collected through ten instruments which are presented in Appendix B.

Five of these instruments were designed to obtain perceptions of comparable aspects of the program from personnel of the four major roles involved: the district coordinator, teacher trainer (two instruments), principal and the new teacher. These five instruments were titled: 1. Interview Guide for District Coordinators; 2. Teacher Trainer Questionnaire; 3. Teacher Trainer Interview Guide; 4. Interview Guide for School Principal; and 5. Teacher Questionnaire.

All these instruments asked for an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the STINT project and for suggestions for improvement. Each was also intended to provide unique information appropriate to the role of the respondent as noted below.

The four other instruments were: 6. The Individual Lesson Observation Report; 7. and 8. Teacher Attendance Instruments; and 9. and 10. Pupil Achievement and Attendance Instruments.

1. Interview Guide for District Coordinators. This was intended to describe a. professional background of the coordinator; b. the process by which the STINT program was implemented in the district; c. the role assumed by each coordinator in carrying out the program; d. the coordinator's view of others attitudes toward STINT; and e. the coordinator's overall evaluation of the program. All of the 27 district coordinators participating in the program were personally interviewed and provided the information requested.

2. and 3. Teacher Trainer Questionnaire and Interview Guide. These two instruments were designed to function together. The Questionnaire was mailed to all teacher trainers to be completed in advance of the interview to obtain the relatively objective and structured information sought. The two instruments were intended to obtain: a. the professional background of the trainer; b. the process by which the STINT program was implemented in the school or schools to which the trainer was assigned; c. the role assumed by the trainer in carrying out the program; d. the trainer's overall evaluation of the program; e. the trainer's perceptions of the factors which contribute to a teacher's profiting from the program; f. the trainer's views on others role in, and attitudes towards, STINT; g. problems

faced by the beginning teachers to which the trainer was assigned; h. the techniques used to provide help and support; and i. the trainer's evaluation of the effectiveness of the help in general and of the techniques specifically.

From the time our original lists were compiled from Board of Education records in March, through the time the interviews were being conducted (April 8 to June 12), there were changes in the program personnel. Thirteen teacher trainers had left the position to return to classroom teaching, and eight people on our list were reported as not working as teacher trainers for a variety of reasons. The most common reason (87 percent of the time) was that another teacher was not available to replace the teacher trainer in his classroom assignment.

Some teacher trainers were assigned after the evaluators had compiled the lists. In general, these new appointees preferred not to be interviewed and we respected their request.

Altogether a total of 198 teacher trainers were interviewed and were generally very cooperative.

4. Interview Guide for School Principal. The Interview Guide for School Principal was designed to provide: a. a description of the staffing pattern in the school; b. the principal's perception of the scope of the STINT program in his school and the implementation of the program; c. the principal's perceptions of the factors which contribute to a teacher's profiting from the program; d. the principal's views of other attitudes towards STINT; e. the principal's evaluation of the work of the teacher trainer assigned to his school; f. the principal's evaluation of the teacher trainer; and g. the principal's overall evaluation of the program.

   The original intent was to interview personally all the principals of schools to which a STINT teacher trainer had been assigned. Two hundred ten principals were interviewed. There were more principals interviewed than teacher trainers due to the assignment of 28 teacher trainers to more than one school (according to our records). Seven principals refused to be interviewed.

5. Teacher Questionnaire. The teacher questionnaire began with questions appropriate for all new teachers and concluded with questions specifically for teachers assigned as trainees within the STINT program. Two forms (A and B) were developed to maximize the coverage of aspects of the program which teachers rated. The common section of the Teacher Questionnaire sought information about: a. teacher background and

preparation; b. supervision and help received; c. self evaluation of competence in selected areas; and d. self appraisal of attitudes towards selected teaching situations. (Parts c. and d. were the two areas in which the content of Forms A and B differed.) The separate questions for STINT trainees asked for: e. the teacher's evaluation of the effectiveness of the teacher trainer; and f. his overall evaluation of the STINT program.

a. Teachers Receiving the Teacher Questionnaire. The names of all teachers who had been assisted by teacher trainers were obtained from individual school organization sheets on which the teacher trainers indicated the following information: a. all regularly licensed newly appointed teachers; b. all substitutes with regular class assignments; and c. all teachers in the teacher training program.

All the STINT trainees and non-STINT beginning teachers were sent the Teacher Questionnaire in all of the STINT schools in which in-class observations were made. (See discussion of ILOR below.) In the remaining STINT schools, six STINT trainees and two non-STINT new teachers were randomly selected to receive the Teacher Questionnaire. The total number of Teacher Questionnaires sent to STINT trainees was 1,400, and 400 were sent to non-STINT teachers in STINT schools. A control group of 600 new and inexperienced teachers who were assigned to schools in which there was no STINT teacher trainer was selected from the files of the Board of Education. The response rate for the latter group was so low (8 percent), and equally critical, those questionnaires returned had so many omissions, that the evaluation staff did not consider it appropriate to analyze these data separately.

A letter explaining the nature of the study was packaged together with the Teacher Questionnaire and a postage-free, return self-addressed envelope, and was sent to a total of 2,400 teachers.

There were 197 responses from STINT trainees (14 percent). There were 78 (20 percent) responses from beginning teachers who had not worked with a teacher trainer; these 78 were either from schools having a STINT teacher trainer or from schools not participating in the STINT program. The low proportion of respondents for this questionnaire requires us to interpret these data as suggestive, not conclusive.

6. The Individual Lesson Observation Report (ILOR). The ILOR is essentially a series of structured rating scales which ask a

qualified observer to rate specific aspects of teacher functioning and pupil response. The reliability of the instrument based on the percent of times independent observers agree in their evaluation of the same lesson has been estimated at 90 percent to 96 percent.[1] The version of the IIOR used in this evaluation was revised for use with new teachers in the evaluation of the Intensive Teacher Training Program of 1967.[2]

B. THE INTERVIEWERS AND OBSERVERS

A staff of 11 college graduates, all having some experience with teaching or interviewing, conducted all of the interviews in the evaluation.

There were 13 observers used to report the in-class performance of the selected teachers, all experienced in various aspects of professional education. Eleven were faculty members of Departments and Schools of Education in colleges and universities, and were currently participating in teacher education programs. Six of them were supervising student teachers, and one was a coordinator of student teaching activities. Of the remaining two, one observer was a retired assistant-to-principal, and one was a former classroom teacher with varied educational experiences.

C. SELECTION OF SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS TO BE OBSERVED

The schools to be observed were selected to maintain the same proportions as the allocation of teacher trainers. The factors considered were: borough; whether or not the school was designated a Special Service school;[3] and in keeping with the design of the evaluation, schools were selected in which there were both STINT trainees (teachers who had worked consistently with the teacher trainer) and new and inexperienced teachers who had not received any assistance at all from the teacher trainer. In order to observe other new teachers, a comparative sample of schools which did not have a STINT teacher trainer was also selected from both types of schools. Even though relatively few observations were sought in these comparison schools, it was eventually necessary to abandon this part of the original plan due to the unwillingness of many of the principals to permit observers in classes.

---

[1] Reliability of the IIOR is discussed at length in David J. Fox, "Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program," The Center for Urban Education, September 1967.

[2] David J. Fox and Audrey Herr, "Intensive Teacher Training Program, 1967-68," The Center for Urban Education, December 1968.

[3] The Special Service classification is assigned to a school by the Board of Education of New York City on the basis of a number of criteria, including overall retardation of at least two years in reading and mathematics, a large percentage of pupils receiving free lunch, and a high rate of teacher and pupil mobility.

There were 74 observations of STINT trainees and 14 observations of non-STINT teachers conducted in 20 Special Service schools having a STINT teacher trainer. Thirty-nine STINT trainees and nine non-STINT teachers were observed in ten non-Special Service schools participating in the program.

7. and 8. Teacher Attendance Instruments. Two instruments in this project were developed to secure data on teacher attendance in STINT and non-STINT schools. The first instrument was a postcard sent to each principal of a sample school asking him whether he wished to provide attendance data on selected teachers or preferred our sending a staff clerk to his school to collect these data (Instrument 7: Preference Form for Teacher Attendance). Then in accord with the principal's preference, the Teacher Attendance Form (Instrument 8) was completed by his clerk or ours. The preference card was sent to 100 randomly selected STINT schools and to the 200 non-STINT schools to which the 600 new and inexperienced control group teachers were assigned. The request was for the number of days absent for each of a maximum of eight teachers. The requested attendance data were returned by 82 (82 percent) of the STINT schools, and 152 (76 percent) of the non-STINT schools. These data were also obtained for all but five of the 30 STINT schools in which teachers were observed.

9. and 10. Pupil Achievement and Attendance Instruments. Pupil Achievement data were obtained by staff clerks from the official test results at the New York City Board of Education, with the clerks completing the Pupil Achievement Form (Instrument 9) for each class selected for study. Then from each Pupil Achievement Form, the names of six children were randomly selected and added to the Pupil Attendance Form (Instrument 10) which was a postcard sent to the teacher of the class with a letter requesting her to provide the numbers of days absent and present in the 1968-69 school term for each child listed.

Reading achievement data were obtained for 29 of the 30 STINT schools in which there were in-class observations, and four other STINT schools. These data were collected for pupils of all teachers (new and experienced) of grade four. There were 65 classes of STINT trainees [illegible]5 classes of non-STINT new teachers, and 60 classes of experienced teachers. The same proportions of Special Service and non-Special Service schools existed here as in the sample of schools to be observed.

D. ANALYSIS OF DATA

The two phases of this evaluation yield different kinds of data. The way in which these data were analyzed will be presented and discussed here. The .05 level of significance was used throughout wherever applicable.

1. Descriptive Data for Teacher Trainers

The teacher trainer application forms provided two kinds of data; the applicants' background and preparation, and the principals' ratings of the applicants' teaching ability and personal attributes.

As was noted earlier the number of trainers varied slightly throughout the program as persons were reassigned. Applications were available for 183 (of approximately 235) trainers, an initial group of 111 teacher trainers assigned in June 1968, and a group of 72 principal-selected teacher trainers appointed in February 1969. In addition applications were available for a group of 83 applicants who were not selected to become teacher trainers.

The objective data were tabulated and frequency distributions obtained in number and percent for each of the groups. Content analyses were conducted for open-ended questions and the findings categorized and tabulated for frequency distributions and percents. The findings were reported separately and comparisons made for the groups being studied.

2. Qualitative Data

There were three different kinds of data produced by the instruments used in this phase of the evaluation.

The interview guides and questionnaire for district coordinators, school principals, teacher trainers and teachers consisted of both objective type questions and open ended questions. The objective responses were tabulated and frequency distributions in numbers and percent were obtained for each group of respondents according to the kind of school to which they were assigned, Special Service and non-Special Service.

All open-ended questions were subjected to an individual content analysis. Codes were developed for each category of responses, following which all such responses were coded and tabulated for frequency distributions in number and percent. Here too the results were analyzed by the group of respondents and the type of school in which they were serving.

Individual Lesson Observation Report (ILOR)

The Laivshe-Baker Nomograph was used to test for the statistical significance of the observed differences in the distribution of ratings for two groups of beginning teachers in STINT schools: those working directly with the teacher trainer and those not receiving assistance from the teacher trainer. Then, as noted earlier, data from previous evaluations were used to compare the ratings given the trainees and those given beginning teachers serving on a substitute license who participated in an intensive teacher training program, beginning teachers serving on a "regular" license who had therefore completed a conventional teacher education program, and a mixed sample of new and experienced teachers from Special Service schools.

Patterns were also tested for statistical significance using the sign test.

3. Comparative Data

From the beginning of this evaluation, it was recognized that there were unique problems in this study in attempting to use an experimental-control group design, or in fact in attempting to provide any second set of data which could be used as a comparison baseline for the evaluation of the data from STINT trainees. We knew that in part the assignment of teacher trainers had been made with the objective of providing help to schools most in need (in terms of proportion of new teachers and difficulty of teaching assignment). Moreover, within a school to which a teacher trainer had been assigned we also knew from our interviews with principals that when there were more new teachers than the trainer could reasonably handle, most principals had tried to identify the teachers most likely to need help from among both new and experienced teachers, considering such criteria as the kind of teacher training program from which the new teacher had graduated, the nature and extent of the student teaching experience, and previous teaching performance. These two points meant that neither the schools to which, nor the teachers to whom, a trainer had been assigned could not be considered to have been randomly selected.[4] This meant, of course, that the schools left without a trainer, or teachers not assigned to a trainer in schools with one, could not be assumed to represent populations comparable to STINT schools.

---

[4] We are not suggesting that they should have been. From the program's point of view it obviously made sense to assign them to areas of greatest need. This is simply an example of how program and evaluation needs often lead in different directions.

Yet the difficulty of identifying some meaningful control data did not eliminate the need for such data. Two aspects of the evaluation, the in-class performance of the STINT trainees and the achievement and attendance of the children in the classes they taught, could not be evaluated in the absence of comparison data. We therefore have done two things to resolve this problem.

To provide a base-line for the evaluation of in-class teaching performance we have used the data obtained during the evaluation of the 1967 Intensive Teacher Training Program (ITTP). This evaluation, conducted by the same staff as has conducted the STINT evaluation, included the evaluation of the in-class teaching performance on new teachers by professional educators who visited classes in May and June of 1968. These observers used the same instrument (IIOR) used in this evaluation of STINT, and moreover were, in large part, the same people. The ITTP evaluation provides two sets of comparison data, that obtained from the in-class performance of the graduates of the ITTP program of 1967 who had received conditional substitute licenses, and that obtained from the in-class performance of the randomly selected sample of new teachers who had graduated from the traditional undergraduate program of teacher preparation and had the regular common branch license.

The comparison data for new teachers from the ITTP evaluation report[5] were obtained from 53 observations of substitute teachers (ITTP), and 22 regularly licensed teachers from Special Service schools. In non-Special Service schools there were 42 substitute teachers and 21 regular teachers observed.

The third comparison group were a combination of seven new and experienced teachers from 16 Special Service who were observed as part of the More Effective Schools evaluation[6] conducted in 1968 using much the same observation instrument and team of observers as in the STINT evaluation.

To provide some basis for estimating the functioning of children we have used two sets of comparison data. Both were obtained from the same schools as those to which the teacher trainers were assigned and in which the trainees were teaching. This eliminated the problem of finding schools comparable to those to which the teacher trainers were assigned. One of the two sets of data was obtained from the children in the classes taught by the new teachers not assigned to the teacher trainer. We have noted above that one must assume, in fact one knows by definition, that these were the new teachers judged by their principal to be less likely to need the help of the teacher trainer. Thus they provide a reasonable level of expectation for the trainees and the children in the trainees' classes. We would expect that in the absence of STINT, all other things being equal, the children in the classes of these new non-STINT teachers would do better than the children in the classes of the STINT teachers. If STINT makes an immediate difference, they would not. The second set of data comes from the functioning of children in the classes taught by experienced teachers in the STINT schools, providing a still higher level of comparison. Here we would expect that these children should function better than the children in the classes taught by either of the groups of new teachers.

---

[5] Fox and Herr, op. cit.

[6] David J. Fox, et al., "More Effective Schools," Project No. 0368, The Center for Urban Education, December 1968.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEACHER TRAINER

A. INTRODUCTION

This section is an evaluation of characteristics of three groups of applicants for the STINT teacher trainer positions: 1. those of the 152 teacher trainers who applied and were accepted for teacher trainer positions by the Board of Education Office of Personnel and the District Superintendent in June 1968 and for whom applications were available (N = 111); 2. applicants primarily chosen by their principals and approved by District Superintendents in February 1969 (N = 72); and 3. those of the 165 June applicants who were not accepted (N = 83) for teacher trainer positions in June of 1968, although they were willing to accept a change of district, meaning that they were rejected for another reason. Data were obtained from a three part completed application form from which two parts, background data provided by the applicant and an evaluation of the applicant completed by the principal, were available for analysis. This section will deal primarily with characteristics of groups One and Two (those accepted), after which differences between these groups and group Three (the rejected group) will be noted.

B. ACCEPTED APPLICANTS

1. Background Data

Data provided by the applicants concerned sex, marital status, professional course preparation, license held, tenure, teaching experience, and reasons for wishing to participate in the program.

Ninety percent of the teacher trainers accepted in both June and February were women, two-thirds of whom were married.

All trainers had taken methods courses and more than half also had taken courses in guidance, child development and psychology (65 percent, 68 percent)[1] and curriculum development courses (52 percent, 59 percent). Community or minority problems and human relations courses were taken by half (52 percent) of the February appointees, but only 39 percent of the June appointees. Courses taken less frequently were special education (44 percent, 32 percent), diagnosis and treatment of reading disabilities (41 percent, 40 percent), supervision and administration (36 percent, 20 percent), English as a second language (27 percent, 26 percent), educational research and measurement (24 percent, 20 percent), foundations, history, and philosophy of education (23 percent, 30 percent), and speech (18 percent, 25 percent).

---

[1] When two numbers appear in parentheses, the first refers to the June appointees, and the second to the February appointees.

Almost all of those accepted had Common Branches licenses. The few remaining had Early Childhood licenses or licenses such as CRMD. Approximately one-fourth of the teacher trainers held additional licenses, most frequently as Assistant Principal. The model response for "year of appointment to the license" was 1960-1964, while the median was 1955-1959. Recent appointments (1965-68) comprised only a small percentage of those accepted (4 percent, 17 percent).

Almost all (97 percent, 89 percent) teacher trainers had received tenure, with the modal June appointee having received tenure earlier (1960-64) than the February appointee (1965-69).

The great majority of trainers (90 percent, 80 percent) had taught for five or more years as regularly licensed teachers, the modal response being "beyond ten years" (45 percent, 41 percent). A large number of trainers had also taught as substitutes (85 percent, 70 percent) most from one to four years (77 percent, 70 percent).

In terms of grades taught as regularly licensed teachers, the modal response was one or two (43 percent, 52 percent), with the remaining teachers having taught three grades (35 percent, 14 percent) or four or more grades (22 percent, 34 percent). Maximum years taught per grade was generally between one and four (45 percent, 60 percent), with fewer personnel having taught one grade for five to ten years (44 percent, 28 percent) and for more than ten years (11 percent, 12 percent). The same was true of grades taught as a substitute teacher, usually being one or two (78 percent, 68 percent) for a maximum of one to four years in each grade (92 percent, 85 percent).

Modal response for "total number of grades taught" (regular or substitute), therefore, was "greater than four" (37 percent, 39 percent) with maximal experience in any grade being generally between five and ten years (49 percent, 45 percent).

While the majority of June appointees (61 percent) agreed to change districts if necessary, this was true of very few (21 percent) February appointees. Some of those who answered yes, however, had reservations about doing so (16 percent, 6 percent), posing such problems as traveling.

2. Principals' Ratings

A vast majority of trainers were rated "excellent" by principals in all three areas questioned: teaching ability, interpersonal relations, and personal qualities. June appointees were rated slightly more favorably than February appointees. In the first area, almost all were rated "excellent" in both sub-categories, "classroom teaching" (93 percent, 82 percent) and "teacher training" (91 percent, 77 percent). In the second area, interpersonal relationships were considered strongest (more "excellent" ratings) with supervisors (93 percent, 83 percent) and with children (88 percent, 86 percent) but also predominantly "excellent" with teachers (86 percent, 79 percent), parents (86 percent, 75 percent) and auxiliary personnel (85 percent, 79 percent). All personal qualities listed were generally rated "excellent" by principals: "professional attitude" (94 percent, 89 percent), "appearance" (91 percent, 87 percent), "alertness" (90 percent, 87 percent), "energy" (87 percent, 84 percent), and "adaptability" (87 percent, 76 percent).

The strength of the trainers most frequently mentioned by principals was "teaching ability (classroom)" (72 percent, 65 percent). Also mentioned as strengths for at least 50 percent of both groups of trainers were "professional attitude: cooperative, dedicated, conscientious," and "interpersonal relations" (55 percent, 51 percent). "Teacher training ability and motivation," while listed as a strength for 62 percent of the June appointees, was listed infrequently (24 percent) for the February group.

At the time of application, all of the trainers were wanted as teacher trainers by the principals who responded.[2]

C. COMPARISON OF REJECTED AND ACCEPTED APPLICANTS

While slight differences appeared in backgrounds of accepted and rejected applicants, the greatest differences appeared in principal evaluation of the applicants.

1. Comparison of Backgrounds

Slight differences appeared between accepted and rejected groups in sex of applicants, teaching experience, and professional course work.

More men appeared in the rejected group (36 percent) than in the accepted group (ten percent).

Generally, applicants rejected had slightly less teaching experience than did those accepted. Although the modal numbers of rejected applicants were appointed to their license earlier than those accepted, recent appointments (1965-68) were greater in the rejected group (23 percent) than in the accepted groups (4 percent, 17 percent). A greater number of rejected applicants (40 percent) received tenure recently (between 1965-69) than did those accepted (22 percent, 34 percent). A greater number of rejected applicants (37 percent) had no more than four years teaching experience in license than did those accepted (10 percent, 20 percent). A smaller proportion of those rejected (26 percent) taught as many as four grades than those accepted (37 percent, 39 percent), and typically the maximum number of years taught per grade was smaller for the rejected group (between one and four years) than for the accepted group (between five and ten years).

---

[2] For 4 percent of the June, and 10 percent of the February appointees, principals did not answer this question.

Generally, rejected applicants had fewer professional courses than those accepted, although the kinds of courses were comparable. Methods courses were most frequently taken (96 percent), followed by Curriculum Development (50 percent) and Guidance (46 percent). Other courses were taken by fewer than four out of ten applicants.

2. Comparison of Principal Ratings

The greatest number of rejected applicants receiving an "excellent" rating for any one category was 34 percent (as compared with 94 percent for those accepted). Although the major strength of these applicants, according to principals, was the same as that of the other two groups (teaching ability in the classroom), it was noted as excellent far less frequently (40 percent compared to 77 percent and 93 percent).

Finally, as contrasted with the accepted group, more than half (54 percent) of the rejected applicants were not wanted as teacher trainers by their principals.

CHAPTER IV

THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER TRAINER

A. SOURCE OF DATA

Information concerning the role of the teacher trainer was obtained from interviews with 198 teacher trainers and questionnaires sent to 229 teacher trainers. Of the 229, 191 (83 percent) responded: 137 teacher trainers in Special Service schools, and 54 in non-Special Service schools.

B. SELECTION OF TRAINEES

For the most part (80 percent, 79 percent),[1] the teacher trainees were selected by the principal although, in a substantial number of instances (16 percent, 19 percent) they were chosen by the principal in consultation with the teacher trainers. A very small percentage (4 percent, 2 percent) of the teacher trainers responded that there was no selection since all new teachers were automatically designated teacher trainees.

Teacher trainers were asked to list the criteria by which teacher trainees were selected. The criterion most frequently mentioned was that the teacher was "new and inexperienced" (80 percent, 83 percent). The next most frequently mentioned criterion (31 percent, 17 percent), however, was that the teacher "needed help," and/or "needed to be worked with." In some instances (12 percent, 10 percent) the fact that the teacher was "new to the school" was the criterion, even though the teacher had previous experience.

When asked specifically why teachers with experience were designated as trainees, the most frequently mentioned reason (40 percent, 32 percent) was "weakness in teaching skills," while the second most frequently given reason (36 percent, 36 percent) was that although the trainee had taught prior to September of 1969, he had taught for only six months. In addition, "newness to grade or school" was mentioned (26 percent, 29 percent) in response to this question also.

C. DROPPING OF TRAINEES

Based on data from the trainers, 407 (14 percent) of 2,965 trainees were dropped from the program during the year. More teacher trainers in non-Special Service schools were able to drop trainees (73 percent dropped at least one trainee) than in Special Service schools

---

[1] The first percent listed refers to Special Service schools, the second to non-Special Service schools.

(57 percent). Although the number of trainees dropped per trainer ranged from one to 20, in Special and non-Special Service schools the median was three.

The primary reason (65 percent, 64 percent) for which trainees were dropped was their attainment of adequate proficiency. However, substantial numbers of trainees were also dropped due to reasons outside of the job, such as the trainee leaving the school due to medical problems, the army, marriage, return to school, or acceptance of another position (46 percent, 50 percent). Only rarely was a trainee dropped for a job-related reason other than proficiency. When it happened it involved the lack of response on the part of the trainee or that the trainee was unable to work with the class(es) assigned or conflict with supervisor and other staff (15 percent, 14 percent).

D. GRADE PLACEMENT OF TRAINEES

The grade placements of the 2,630 teacher trainees still assigned to a teacher trainer as of April included all grades from K-6, as well as OTP positions (physical education, health conservation, remedial reading, teaching English as a second language), teachers of mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed, library science, guidance positions, auxiliary and above quota positions.

Of the 2,630 teacher trainees, 2,063 (78 percent) taught grades K-6. The grade most often taught by the trainees was third grade (20 percent), with fourth (19 percent) and second (17 percent) grades running a close second and third respectively. Kindergarten was the grade taught least often (3 percent).

E. RATIO OF TRAINEES TO TEACHER TRAINER

All teacher trainers interviewed were asked how many trainees they worked with. For the most part, one teacher trainer helped from six to ten trainees (50 percent, 56 percent). Few had small loads of fewer than five trainees (19 percent, 13 percent) or large loads of more than 15 (12 percent, 8 percent).

F. MATERIALS AND PHYSICAL FACILITIES AVAILABLE TO TEACHER TRAINERS

In both Special Service and non-Special Service schools about half of the trainers (55 percent, 55 percent) reported that materials had been specially provided for their role as teacher trainers. The Teacher Training Manual from the Board of Education was most frequently mentioned (45 percent, 35 percent). Curriculum guidelines were also mentioned by a large percentage (34 percent, 38 percent) with fewer than 20 percent mentioning materials from the Board of Education other than the Manual, and materials from the district office.

The most common physical facility available to the teacher trainers was one classroom or office shared with one other person, true for half (43 percent, 50 percent) of the teacher trainers. A private office was available rarely (18 percent, 20 percent). Somewhat fewer were crowded, sharing a room with between two to four other teacher trainers (17 percent, 5 percent).

A few (3 percent, 15 percent) reported no special facility available other than the teachers' own room or lounge, or only a desk (11 percent, 3 percent); no facilities at all were reported by 12 percent of the teacher trainers in Special Service schools, and by 30 percent of those in non-Special Service schools.[2]

G. MATERIALS AND PHYSICAL FACILITIES NEEDED

Three of five (61 percent, 55 percent) of the responding teacher trainers stated that in order for the program to function at maximum effectiveness, materials not presently available were needed. The most frequently mentioned (33 percent, 32 percent) materials needed were audio-visual aides (projectors, films, videotapes, tape recorders). A resource center including textbooks, and curriculum guides and bulletins was the second most frequently mentioned needed facility (27 percent, 29 percent). Specific materials and equipment were mentioned. Included in this category were language materials, current literature, social studies and Negro History materials, and math and science guides and equipment. Miscellaneous supplies mentioned were office machines, typewriters, rexographs, and staplers.

A majority of the responding teacher trainers (72 percent, 60 percent) felt that additional physical facilities were needed in order that the program function at maximum effectiveness. An office was noted most frequently (53 percent, 48 percent), followed by requests for space for conferences (20 percent, 20 percent), and space for displays and demonstrations (18 percent, 23 percent).

H. DYNAMICS OF THE JOB

Teacher trainers were asked to think back to their last complete work week, and estimate the hours of their time spent in the activities listed below. Table IV-1 presents the mean hours estimated for each activity listed. As can be seen from the table, teacher trainers in both Special Service and non-Special Service schools devoted more time to "direct work with teachers" than to any other activity mentioned, averaging 13 hours a week on this. The second most time-consuming activity for trainers in both kinds of schools was "conferences with individual teachers" (six hours). All other activities were estimated as taking between two and four hours per week.

---

[2] These percents add to more than 100 percent because there were differing facilities in schools in which some teacher trainers were placed.

TABLE IV-1

SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES OF TEACHER TRAINER
(TTI 31 a-k, 32,33)

	Mean Number of Hours Devoted to Activity		Proportion Considering Activity "Most Rewarding"		Proportion Considering Activity "Least Rewarding"	
Activities	S.S. Schools	Non-S.S. Schools	S.S. Schools	Non-S.S. Schools	S.S. Schools	Non-S.S. Schools
Direct work with teachers	13	13	68	74	0	0
Conferences with individual teachers	6	6	32	23	2	0
Conferences with groups	2	1	6	6	9	14
Workshops for trainees	1	1/4	5	0	4	0
Working with individual children	2	2	9	0	5	0
Working with groups	3	2	5	6	2	7
Conferences with parents	1	1	2	0	6	3
Conferences with district personnel	1/2	1/2	2	6	11	17
Attending conferences (District)	1/2	1/4	2	0	19	10
Attending workshops (District)	1/4	1/4	2	0	5	7
Attending conferences for all STINT personnel	1/4	--	2	6	19	28
None	--	--	0	0	20	17

While direct work with teachers was not only the activity to which teacher trainers devoted the most time, it was most often listed as their most rewarding activity (68 percent, 74 percent) and never listed as the least rewarding activity. Since conferences with teachers was the second most frequently listed as a rewarding activity, we can conclude that the trainers liked what they were doing (or were doing what they liked!). The least rewarding activity for both teacher trainers in Special Service and in non-Special Service schools (19 percent, 28 percent) was most often listed as "attending District conferences for all STINT personnel."

Frequently mentioned activities not listed on the table were special projects, programs and exhibits, such as the Family Living Program (21 percent, 33 percent), work with paraprofessionals and Educational Assistants (26 percent, 24 percent) and working with community groups and workshops with parents (16 percent, 33 percent). Also mentioned less frequently, was consultation work (with guidance counselors, principals, assistant principals, and other staff), curriculum work (providing books, demonstration lessons, programming for the entire school), and work with disturbed children.

Three of five teacher trainers (57 percent, 65 percent) visited their trainees in the classroom on a regularly scheduled basis, usually three times per week. None of the trainers in non-Special Service schools visited their trainees less than once per week, and only three (4 percent) of those in Special Service schools visited their trainees this infrequently. Trainees were visited every day by six (23 percent) of the responding teacher trainers in non-Special Service schools, and by 30 (37 percent) of those in Special Service schools.

Of those trainers who did not visit classrooms on a regularly scheduled basis, the majority visited upon request by the trainee, when a special problem arose. A few trainers not visiting the classrooms of their trainees on a regularly scheduled basis, reported that they visited when they "had the time," when "new curricula" were being taught, or upon "request by the supervisor or principal."

I. TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED

Table IV-2 lists the techniques suggested for use by the teacher trainer in the materials supplied by the central staff of STINT, the frequency with which the trainers reported using them, and the proportion of times the trainer rated the techniques as "effective" when used. Obviously there was a wide range in the use of these techniques, from the almost unanimous use of individual conferences (96 percent) to the infrequent use of video-taped observations (4 percent). The dominant approach to method was individual conferences and planning, and demonstration lessons. Of perhaps greater interest is the consistently high appraisal of the effectiveness with which the trainer rated the separate methods. Both frequently and infrequently used

TABLE IV-2

UTILIZATION OF TEACHER TRAINING TECHNIQUES AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS BY TEACHER TRAINERS IN PERCENT

Techniques Reported Used Frequently by:	Utilization	Effectiveness
A. More than 75 percent		
Individual conferences	96	96
Individual planning	88	88
Pre-planning demonstration lessons with trainee	85	83
Demonstration lessons with the trainee's class	84	87
Follow-up conferences to demonstration lesson	83	89
B. Between 60 and 74 percent		
Use of instructional materials	66	87
Planning for individual children	62	79
Micro-teaching with whole class	62	80
Skills and techniques of micro-teaching	61	82
Methods and materials of micro-teaching	60	78
C. Between 41 and 59 percent		
Workshops in methods and procedures	59	80
Micro-teaching in small groups	51	80
Group conferences	48	82
Curriculum materials development workshop	47	78
Workshops for curriculum study	45	73
Planning cooperatively (pairs and groups)	42	77
D. Between 21 and 40 percent		
Workshops in plan book organization and content	39	74
Workshops in room and display materials	36	77
Study of curriculum materials	36	69
Intervisitation to experienced teachers	35	69

TABLE IV-2 (continued)

Techniques Reported Used Frequently by:	Utilization	Effectiveness
D. Between 21 and 40 percent (cont.)		
Conferences with group of trainees to discuss common lesson observations	34	76
Conferences in self-evaluation by trainees	34	72
Follow-up conferences with trainees of commonly observed lesson with the other teacher present	31	72
Pre-planning before an observation of other teachers	28	84
Grade conferences with supervisors	27	65
Grade conferences regarding goals and expectations	23	60
Grade conferences regarding curriculum materials	22	66
E. Less than 21 percent		
Follow-up conferences with trainees after observation of other teacher without observed teacher present	19	77
Intervisitation to other trainees	16	76
Use of films and tapes of lessons for analysis and discussion	12	74
Conferences with curriculum coordinators	11	58
Conferences with curriculum consultants and specialists	10	59
Video-taped observations of other teachers	4	58

methods were perceived as effectively employed by a majority of the trainers, with that majority ranging up to the 96 percent who rated the individual conferences as "effective."

J. DUTIES OF THE TEACHER TRAINER OUTSIDE OF STINT

Most of the STINT teacher trainers devoted 100 percent of their working time to their STINT duties. Thus, of the 158 teacher trainers in Special Service schools, 138 (87 percent) spent all of their time on STINT duties, as did 34 (85 percent) of the 40 teacher trainers in non-Special Service schools. Most of the others (9 percent, 13 percent) devoted more than half of their time to STINT duties, so only a few (4 percent, 3 percent) reported having devoted half or less of their time to STINT duties.

Duties performed by teacher trainers in addition to STINT were of a supervisory nature, such as assisting the principal or assistant principal, or, less often, liaison duties, or other training duties such as training of student teachers and paraprofessional personnel.

It should be mentioned here, however, that trainees were not the only teachers benefiting from the help of the teacher trainers. Thus, 35 of the 254 schools from which organization sheets were received reported a total of 170 teachers who, although not officially teacher trainees, were told to ask trainers for help when it was needed. When asked if they had been called upon to help teachers other than their trainees, 112 (72 percent) of the responding teacher trainers in Special Service schools answered affirmatively, as did 39 (98 percent) of those responding from non-Special Service schools. This, then, was the most frequent assignment beyond STINT, and is evidence of the "spill-over" effect we have referred to before.

K. TRAINERS' EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

Four criteria for estimating the trainers' evaluation of the STINT program were employed: 1. their rating of the effectiveness of the technique they used; 2. the effect of STINT on attitudes of the school personnel; 3. whether they wished to continue in the program; and 4. their appraisal of the strengths, weaknesses and overall impact of the program.

1. Effectiveness of Techniques

As was noted in Table IV-2 on utilization and effectiveness of training techniques, all of the techniques mentioned as most frequently employed by trainers were rated as effective by at least 80 percent of the trainers. Thus, 96 percent of the trainers using individual conferences rated them as "above average" in effectiveness; similarly, individual planning was labeled above average in effectiveness by 88 percent of the trainers and preplanning of demonstration lessons was labeled above average in effectiveness by 83 percent of the trainers, and conferences following up demonstration lessons above average in effectiveness by 89 percent of the teacher trainers, and demonstration lessons with the trainee's class were rated above average by 87 percent of the teacher trainers. Clearly they thought well of what they did.

To evaluate the trainer's effectiveness in dealing with trainee problems, a list of potential problems of the trainees was given to the teacher trainers. They were asked to indicate, on a seven-point scale, the seriousness of the problem in the first half of the year, and then in the second half of the year, as well as the effectiveness of their own assistance in solving each of these problems.

As may be seen from Table IV-3 the trainers considered that problems were generally very effectively dealt with, and thought that only one of the five problems which were considered serious by more than 50 percent of the trainers in the first half of the year (discipline) remained so in the second half. Only 43 percent of the 138 responding teacher trainers felt that the teachers with whom they worked were effective in dealing with this problem.

The remaining four problems, which were acknowledged as serious by at least 50 percent of the responding trainers in the first half of the year, yet not in the second half of the year, were routines of class and classroom management, methods of teaching reading, general methods of teaching, and planning of lessons.

As might be assumed from the fact that these problems were mentioned as severe in the beginning of the year, yet not at the end, effectiveness of trainer help was rated highly. Thus, 64 percent of the trainers who responded as to the effectiveness of their help with problems of routines of class and classroom management felt that their aid was effective, as did 69 percent for their help with methods of teaching reading, 70 percent for the effectiveness of their help in dealing with general methods of teaching, and 65 percent for the effectiveness of their help with planning lessons.

2. Morale and Attitudes

When teacher trainers were asked to rate the morale of the trainees as compared with other beginning teachers, responses indicated a belief that morale of the trainees was greatly improved over that of other beginning teachers. Thus, of the 164 responding teacher trainers, half (51 percent) reported that the trainees had "much better" morale than other beginning teachers, and a third (34 percent) that they had "somewhat better" morale than other beginning teachers. Only a few (12 percent) reported that they had "about the same" morale as other beginning teachers and only one trainer (less than 1 percent) reported "somewhat worse" morale than other beginning teachers. No trainers responded that they had "much worse" morale than other beginning teachers.

TABLE IV-3

TEACHER TRAINER PERCEPTIONS OF THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE PROBLEMS OF THEIR TRAINEES AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ASSISTANCE THEY PROVIDED, IN PERCENT[a]

	N	Serious Problem both at Beginning and End of Year	Serious Problem at Beginning but NOT at End	Not Serious at Beginning and End	Proportion Who Rated Help at Beginning as Effective
General methods of teaching	138	32	51	12	70
Methods of teaching reading	158	31	56	8	69
Methods of teaching math	136	28	47	14	65
Planning lessons: daily, weekly, unit, term	135	17	51	26	65
Development of instructional materials	129	18	32	39	67
Use of instructional materials	125	13	36	40	70
New educational media, i.e., programmed instruction	78	12	17	68	72
Evaluation of learning, test, grades, etc.	134	10	32	52	78
Expectation of pupil achievement	108	8	42	43	69
Motivating a class	132	23	40	27	58
Questioning techniques	132	23	44	27	62
Understanding children's behavior	100	30	41	21	35
Discipline in the classroom	138	50	42	7	43
Routines of class and classroom management	137	21	63	9	64
Clerical tasks, i.e. roll books	134	10	34	45	87

TABLE IV-3 (continued)

	N	Serious Problem both at Beginning and End of Year	Serious Problem at Beginning but NOT at End	Not Serious at Beginning and End	Proportion Who Rated Help at Beginning as Effective
Providing for individual differences	136	20	41	28	58
Providing for the exceptional child	111	14	28	46	60
Group activities--large and small	126	18	37	35	64
Special services in the school i.e., guidance	111	24	19	47	57
Pupil-teacher relationships	122	21	36	33	64
Parent-teacher relationships	107	5	20	67	78
Teacher-paraprofessional relationships	93	2	9	81	84
Teacher-co-worker relationships	69	3	10	85	74
Teacher-principal relationships	73	6	6	86	73
Teacher (trainee)-teacher trainer relationships	74	2	4	92	76
School-community relations	63	2	3	84	71
Professional relations, i.e., organizations	36	1	1	96	72
Self-evaluation (strengths and weaknesses)	85	12	21	62	62

[a] The proportions missing to account for 100 percent were ratings of "serious at end of year, but not at beginning."

In terms of attitudes of other school personnel, as perceived by the teacher trainers, large majorities (61 percent to 96 percent) of almost all district and school staff were seen as "very favorably" oriented to the program. Most often noted as having the extremely favorable attitude (according to the teacher trainers) were district superintendents (96 percent), the district curriculum coordinator (90 percent), and the STINT district coordinator (91 percent). Next came the principal (87 percent) and assistant principal (76 percent), trainees (84 percent), followed by school non-teaching professional and non-professional staff, parents and community organizations (all 71 to 73 percent). Least often (46 percent) believed to have an extremely favorable attitude were the "other teachers in the school."

3. Continuing as a Trainer

Almost every teacher trainer (96 percent, 97 percent) reported that he would like to continue work as a teacher trainer next year. Reasons for wishing to continue to participate in the program fell into two categories: one emphasizing the need for the program, and the other with an emphasis on job satisfaction.

Of the 158 teacher trainers in the Special Service schools, 50 (34 percent) wished to continue because of their belief in the need for the program as did 13 (35 percent) of the responding teacher trainers in non-Special Service schools. Larger majorities (75 percent, 89 percent) of the teacher trainers wished to continue their STINT jobs due to personal satisfaction, involving specifics such as the trainers "enjoying the work," "enjoying seeing children grow," or doing a rewarding job (38 percent, 57 percent) and the trainers "learning through the work" (learning skills, increasing their ability to handle problems or to develop rapport with new teachers), (32 percent, 24 percent).

Generally (94 percent, 92 percent) the teacher trainers wanted to continue in the school to which they were now assigned. Only one in seven (6 percent, 8 percent) of the teacher trainers said they would not like to continue as trainers in the same school in which they had been working, most often because they would like to return to their original school. Only three teacher trainers wished to transfer due to conflict with the assistant principal, since we noted earlier that the district coordinators mentioned the role conflict between these two positions.

4. Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

General strengths of the program listed by the teacher trainers were similar to the strengths listed by the district coordinators, although with a slightly different emphasis. The strength most frequently mentioned (46 percent) by trainers in Special Service schools was the ability for the trainee to ask a peer, rather than a supervisor, for help, without fear of losing a job by appearing incompetent. Other strengths frequently mentioned were the moral support which the program afforded the trainee (36 percent); provisions for practical help (i.e., curriculum, methodology, discipline, motivation and methods), (33 percent). The flexibility of the program, and the program's mere existence, were each mentioned by 32 percent of the teacher trainers.

These same strengths were mentioned by the teacher trainers in non-Special Service schools, although with a different frequency. In these schools, moral support and practical training for trainees were mentioned the most frequently (50 and 53 percent respectively) followed by the help from someone not in authority (43 percent).

The most frequently mentioned weakness in the program was the lack of adequate facilities and space (61 percent, 55 percent) discussed in detail earlier in this section. Also frequently mentioned was the overload of work for the trainer, i.e. he was assigned too many trainees, taught too wide a diversity of grades, and was asked to perform too many other duties as well (32 percent, 14 percent).

Role conflict between assistant principal and teacher trainer was mentioned by 16 percent and 30 percent of the trainers, but apparently this conflict was not severe enough to make many wish to leave their current assignment.[3] Another weakness mentioned was the lack of proper coordination of free time of the trainees within the school, so that they might meet with the teacher trainers together (13 percent, 22 percent). Less frequently mentioned weaknesses (less than 10 percent) were the starting time of the program (some trainers began their duties in February due to opening of new positions), the attitudes and academic preparation of the trainees, lack of a trainee orientation session, and the turnover of personnel.

In terms of teacher trainer preparation, the most frequently mentioned weakness (24 percent, 27 percent) was lack of an orientation program for trainers before the program began.

L. OVERALL EVALUATION

On the whole, the trainers' evaluations of the general effectiveness of the program were favorable. Trainers were asked to rate the general effectiveness of the program on a six-point scale, ranging from excellent to unsatisfactory. Responses fell generally into the "excellent," "very good," and "good" categories, with the greatest number of responses falling into the "very good" category. Thus, of the 178 responding teacher trainers, 30 percent responded that the program was "excellent," 39 percent that it was "very good," 27 percent that it was "good," and only 4 percent that the program was "fair." No one rated it lower than fair.

---

[3] It is, of course, possible that some who said they wished to return to their old school were in conflict as well, but preferred not to say so.

CHAPTER V

THE EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM FUNCTIONING

This chapter presents the data on in-class performance of teachers, obtained by sending professional educators to visit the classes of a sample of the trainees. As was noted in the chapter on procedure, to provide some basis for evaluation, the ratings obtained for the STINT trainees will be compared to ratings obtained from four other groups of teachers: 1. non-STINT beginning teachers in the same schools as the trainees; 2. beginning substitute teachers observed in the Spring of 1968 during the evaluation of the Intensive Teacher Training Program; 3. beginning regularly appointed teachers observed during this same evaluation; and 4. a mixed group of beginning and experienced teachers observed in the Spring of 1968 during the evaluation of the More Effective Schools program.

While no one of these groups can be considered the equivalent of a control group selected before the STINT program began,[1] each of them does provide some useful basis for comparison. The non-STINT beginning teachers were teaching in the same schools as the trainees and were observed in the same time period. That they were not designated as trainees suggests that their principals considered them less likely to need that help by criteria such as training program, experience, and class to be taught, available to the principal at the beginning of the school year. The two sets of data from the ITTP evaluation provide comparisons with new teachers who were graduated from a short-term intensive graduate program of teacher preparation (the beginning substitute teachers) or a regular undergraduate program (beginning regular teachers). Finally, the mixed group of teachers from the schools used as controls in the 1968 More Effective Schools (M.E.S.) study provide a comparison with the staffs of Special Service schools who recieved no special training or assistance (beginning and substitute teachers).

A. TEACHER RATINGS

Table V-1 summarizes the results of the comparisons made between the ratings assigned the trainees and those four comparison groups in the three areas of the ILOR. Two of these areas (teacher functioning and teacher-pupil interaction) have sufficient items to permit statistical tests of significance in the patterns. In neither area was there a statistically significant difference between the trainees and other beginning teachers in the STINT schools. However, the distribution of ratings assigned the STINT trainees was significantly more

---

[1] As discussed in Chapter II, Procedures, it was decided not to seek a sample of teachers' observations from non-STINT schools.

TABLE V-1

SUMMARY OF SIGN TEST PERFORMED ON ILOR PROPORTION OF ABOVE AVERAGE RATINGS

	Comparison		All Schools		
Area	"A"	"B"	"A" Higher	"B" Higher	No Difference
Teacher Functioning	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beginning Teachers	6	7	1
	STINT Trainees	Beginning Substitute Teachers (ITTP)	13	0[a]	1
	STINT Trainees	Beginning Regular Teachers (ITTP)	10	3[a]	1
	STINT Trainees	Beginning and Experienced Teachers (M.E.S.)[b]	8	1[a]	1
Teacher-Pupil Interaction	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beginning Teachers	4	5	1
	STINT Trainees	Beginning Substitute Teachers (ITTP)	7	2	1
	STINT Trainees	Beginning Regular Teachers (ITTP)	7	2	1
	STINT Trainees	Beginning and Experienced Teachers (M.E.S.)[b]	5	3	0

TABLE V-1 (continued)

Area	Comparison		All Schools		
	"A"	"B"	"A" Higher	"B" Higher	No Difference
Teacher Characteristics	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beginning Teachers	1	2	0
	STINT Trainees	Beginning Substitute Teachers (ITTP)	3	0	0
	STINT Trainees	Beginning Regular Teachers (ITTP)	1	2	0
All	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beginning Teachers	11	14	2
	STINT Trainees	Beginning Substitute Teachers (ITTP)	23	2[a]	2
	STINT Trainees	Beginning Regular Teachers (ITTP)	18	7	2
	STINT Trainees	Beginning and Experienced Teachers (M.E.S.)[b]	13	4	1

[a] Significant at .05 level, two tail test comparison made between STINT trainees and group designated in the direction of the STINT trainees.

[b] Comparison data available only for 10 items.

positive than all three other comparison groups in the area of teacher functioning. Differences in the area of teacher-pupil interaction were also in favor of the STINT trainees, but were not statistically significant.

Across all three areas, the pattern of ratings assigned trainees was significantly more positive than that of the beginning substitute teachers (ITTP graduates), but did not differ from any of the other three comparison groups.

Thus, within the limits set by the use of data from different years, the observational data suggest that the STINT trainees reached a level of functioning no different from the other beginning teachers in their schools who had presented more impressive credentials to the principal, better than that achieved by the graduates of the 1967 ITTP program, and no different from a sample of regularly appointed beginning teachers or a mixed group of beginning and experienced teachers in Special Service schools.

Tables V-2, V-3, and V-4 present the proportion of above-average ratings assigned by the observers to each of the groups studied.[2] Table V-2, on teacher functioning, shows the greatest strengths of the trainees was in achieving the objectives of their lessons and in planning and organization, with their style of questioning, level of creativity and use of aids least often rated well.

Considering the modal ratings, the observers in STINT schools reported that they saw lessons which were "above average" in the overall quality of instruction as well as in planning and organization, and achievement of objectives. The extent to which the lesson laid a foundation for future lessons was as often considered "above average" as it was "average." The observers felt that the lessons were "average" in the extent to which provision was made for the children to be physically active participants and "average" in the teacher's understanding of and familiarity with the material, as well as in the amount of material covered and the extent to which the lesson laid foundations for future lessons and referred to earlier material. The use of children's background and experiences and the depth of instruction were as often rated "above average" as "average" or "below average."

B. TEACHER-PUPIL INTERACTION

The aspects of teacher-pupil interaction, rated by the observer, are listed in Table V-3. The modal rating for STINT trainees was above average for eight of the items, below average for one aspect

---

[2] The proportion of "average" and "below average" ratings appears in Tables 1, 2, and 3 of Appendix A.

TABLE V-2

PROPORTION OF ABOVE AVERAGE RATINGS, TEACHER FUNCTIONING IIOR II, BY SAMPLE

No. of Cases: STINT Trainees 113, non-STINT Beginning Teachers in STINT Schools 23, Control Beginning Substitutes 95, Control Beginning Regular Teachers 43, Control Beginning and Experienced Teachers 91

	STINT Schools		Non-STINT Schools		
			ITTP		MES
Aspect	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beg. Tchrs.	Beg. Sub. Tchrs.	Beg. Reg. Tchrs.	Beg. & Exp. Tchrs.
Objectives of lesson achieved	87	86	68	69	a
Planning and organization	65	70	45	56	12
Overall quality of instruction	46	48	36	42	42
Extent lesson laid foundations for future lesson	41	55	19	19	41
Amount of material covered	39	33	29	19	26
Depth of instruction	39	41	33	24	32
Teacher's understanding and familiarity with material	26	40	23	29	a
Use of children's background and experience	26	21	16	16	28
Extent lesson referred to earlier material	23	22	12	23	12
Extent children physically active and involved with what they were doing	22	41	19	24	a
Extent lesson laid foundation for independent work	18	27	18	17	17
Level of creativity and imagination evidenced	15	9	14	14	12
Teacher's style of questioning	15	14	14	7	a
Extent and how effectively teaching aids used	9	9	4	2	2

[a] Comparison data were not available for these aspects.

TABLE V-3

PROPORTION OF ABOVE AVERAGE RATINGS, TEACHER-PUPIL INTERACTION, ILOR II, BY SAMPLE

No. of Cases: STINT Trainees 113, non-STINT Beginning Teachers in STINT Schools 23, Comparative Data on Beginning ITTP Substitutes 95, ITTP Beginning Regular Teachers 43, M.E.S. Beginning and Experienced Teachers 91.

	STINT Schools		Comparative Data		
			ITTP		M.E.S.
Aspect	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beg. Tchrs.	Beg. Sub. Tchrs.	Beg. Reg. Tchrs.	Beg. & Exp. Tchrs. in SS Schools
Teacher's verbal communication with children	94	100	89	88	88
Overall relationship among the children	89	87	79	77	80
Overall teacher-pupil relationship	86	92	73	65	a
Teacher's verbal communication with non-English speaking children	83	80	81	79	a
Overall participation of children	78	78	61	67	66
Children's interest and enthusiasm	67	74	47	46	51
Classroom atmosphere in terms of discipline and in terms of warmth	57	92	57	42	a
Children's volunteering in response to teacher questions	53	50	36	41	40
Teacher's overall handling of the children's questions	32	37	44	47	33
Children raising questions	2	00	4	2	0

[a] Comparison data were not available for these aspects.

(children raising questions), and cut across all three ratings for one (teacher's overall handling of questions). The modal STINT lesson, then, was characterized by an overall teacher-pupil interaction the observers considered "above average" (in almost nine out of ten instances), and took place in a classroom where almost all of the children got along well with each other. The teacher was consistently communicating verbally with both the English speaking and non-English speaking children in the class. More than three of every four children participated in the lessons, with more than two in every three showing a high level of interest and enthusiasm, and half the children responding to the teacher's questions even though almost no children raised questions of their own. The teachers' handling of whatever few questions were raised was as likely considered "above average" as "average" or "below average." As might be expected from this tone of highly positive interpersonal relationships, the classroom atmosphere was warm and disciplined.

C. TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

The third area with which the IIOR was concerned was a small cluster of three items on teacher characteristics, in which the observers were asked to rate the teachers' maturity, confidence, and expectations for the students. The data in Table V-4 indicate that STINT trainees were rated "above average" for maturity and level of self-confidence, but "average" in their ability to communicate to the children a belief in their (the children's) ability to succeed and do well.

TABLE V-4

PERCENTAGE OF ABOVE AVERAGE RATINGS, TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS, ILOR:II, BY SAMPLE

No. of Cases: STINT Trainees 113, non-STINT Beginning Teachers in STINT Schools 23, Comparative Data on Beginning ITTP Substitutes 95, Beginning Regular Teachers 43*

	STINT Schools		Comparative Data	
			ITTP	
Aspect	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beg. Tchrs.	Beg. Sub. Teachers	Beg. Reg. Teachers
Teacher's maturity	46	52	28	30
Teacher's self-confidence	51	44	38	52
Impression teacher gave observer and children about children's maximum level of performance	24	37	15	33

*These ratings not obtained in M.E.S. ratings.

CHAPTER VI

SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM AND ITS OVERT IMPACT ON CHILDREN AND TEACHERS

This chapter presents the data on the scope of the program in terms of the number of new and inexperienced teachers reached by the program as well as on the number of children in the classes of these teachers. Then we move on to the first tentative suggestions of the overt impact of the program on what would be considered "hard" data such as children's achievement in reading, children's attendance, and teacher attendance.

A. SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM

This information was obtained from the 254 school organization sheets submitted by teacher trainers to the evaluation staff, and corroborated in 198 completed teacher trainer interviews. These data indicated that 2,965 teachers were designated as trainees to be assisted by the STINT teacher trainers. In addition, almost three of every four trainers in Special Service schools reported that additional teachers, other than the trainees, called for assistance, as did two of every three trainers in non-Special Service schools. Thus a conservative estimate would be that between 3,000 and 4,000 new teachers received some assistance as a consequence of the introduction of the teacher trainers.

Throughout the year, slightly more than one-tenth of the trainees gained sufficient proficiency for the teacher trainer to discontinue working with them. There were somewhat fewer reported in this group from Special Service schools than non-Special Service schools.

The trainees included teachers of grades pre-K to 6, as well as Other Teaching Personnel such as teachers of the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed. The grade most often taught was third, with second and fourth closely following.

Using an average of 30 children in a class, approximately 90,000 children whose teachers were trainees were reached directly by the STINT program, with the several thousand children in the classes of the other teachers assisted also reached to some extent.

B. CHILDREN'S ACHIEVEMENT AND ATTENDANCE

Metropolitan Achievement Test Scores in reading (Elementary, Form A "Reading") were obtained for children in 150 fourth grade classes in 33 STINT schools. Sixty-five of these classes were taught by STINT trainees, 25 by beginning teachers who were not assigned a trainer and 60 by other, presumably experienced, teachers in the schools. The tests were routinely administered city-wide in April and scores were obtained from the Board of Education.

Table VI-1 presents the grade equivalent scores corresponding to the median, the twenty-fifth and the seventy-fifth percentiles for each group as well as the number of children and the number of classes on which each distribution was based. The distributions consisted of raw scores for individual pupils over classes. Raw score medians and quartiles were subsequently converted into grade equivalents using the norms for use in New York City as supplied by the test publishers. Data for children of teachers in Special Service STINT schools and non-Special Service STINT schools are presented separately.

Educationally meaningful differences were not apparent between the medians obtained by children of STINT trainees and those of non-STINT beginning teachers. The expected differences in children's achievement as a function of the initial differences between these groups of teachers perceived by their principals were not found. The differences expected between scores obtained by children of beginning teachers, whether or not the beginning teachers were STINT trainees and scores obtained by children taught by more experienced teachers were found and, at the median, ranged between .6 and .8 of a year.

Table VI-2 presents a second analysis of these data, the distributions obtained for children taught by each of the six teacher samples, group as to the percent: at or above grade level; up to one year below grade level; between one and 1.9 years below grade level; and two or more years below grade level.

This table presents the data in a far more distressing light, indicating consistently that a majority (typically at least 80 percent) of the children were reading below grade level. However, differences between children taught by STINT trainees and those taught by non-STINT beginning teachers were negligible here also.

In the Special Service schools only 6 percent of the children taught by STINT and non-STINT new teachers were reading at or above grade level, whereas 80 percent of the children taught by STINT trainees and 75 percent taught by non-STINT beginning teachers were reading one or more years below grade level. In comparison the percentages reported at each level for experienced teachers, while higher than for beginning teachers were considerably below the 50 percent normally expected on a standardized test. It should be noted, of course, that this was an exceedingly atypical year for both children and teachers in the New York City school system as the result of a three month teacher strike.

Certainly the most positive set of scores is that obtained for children taught by experienced teachers in non-Special Service schools. Thirty-seven percent of these children were reading at or above grade level, and only 39 percent were one or more years below grade level.

TABLE VI-1

MEDIAN AND QUARTILE GRADE EQUIVALENTS FOR CHILDREN IN FOURTH GRADE TAUGHT BY STINT TRAINERS, NON-STINT BEGINNING TEACHERS, AND EXPERIENCED TEACHERS IN SPECIAL SERVICE AND NON-SPECIAL SERVICE SCHOOLS

	25th Percentile	Median	75th Percentile	Number of Children	Number of Classes
Special Service STINT Schools					
STINT Trainees	2.8	3.3	3.6	862	42
Non-STINT Beginning Teachers	2.9	3.4	3.7	319	16
Experienced Teachers	3.4	4.1	4.7	783	32
Non-Special Service STINT Schools					
STINT Trainees	3.2	3.6	4.3	557	23
Non-STINT Beginning Teachers	3.2	3.6	4.3	217	9
Experienced Teachers	3.4	4.2	5.5	729	28

TABLE VI-2

PERCENT OF CHILDREN TAUGHT BY STINT TRAINEES, NON-STINT BEGINNING TEACHERS AND EXPERIENCED TEACHERS AT VARIOUS GRADE LEVEL INTERVALS

	Percent of Children					
	Special Service STINT Schools			Non-Special Service STINT SCHOOLS		
		Non-STINT			Non-STINT	
Percent of Children	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beginning Teachers	Experienced Teachers	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beginning Teachers	Experienced Teachers
At or above grade level	6	6	26	17	16	37
Up to one year below grade level	14	19	30	24	30	24
Between 1 and 1.9 years below grade level	61	59	36	48	46	31
Two or more years below grade level	19	16	8	11	8	8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

While children of STINT and non-STINT beginning teachers in non-Special Service schools did considerably less well than children of experienced teachers in the same schools, the percentages of children at each level are about the same as those reported for children of experienced teachers in Special Service schools.

Chi-square tests revealed no significant differences between the distributions of children of STINT trainees and children of non-STINT beginning teachers in either Special Service schools ($X^2 = 5.69$, $p > .05$) or non-Special Service schools ($X^2 = 3.24$, $p > .05$).

In Special Service schools the distribution of scores for children taught by experienced teachers was significantly different from those taught by STINT trainees ($X^2 = 245.53$, $p < .001$) and from those taught by non-STINT beginning teachers ($X^2 = 104.45$, $p < .001$). The same was true of the non-Special Service schools where the comparison between the distribution of scores for STINT trainees with those for experienced teachers and the distribution of scores of non-STINT new teachers compared to experienced teachers yielded significant ($p < .001$) chi-squares of 77.72 and 38.4 respectively.

In terms of the earlier comments on the differences in credentials implied in the principals' designations of some new teachers as trainees, the lack of difference in achievement between children taught by the trainees (those teachers with the less impressive credentials and/or the more difficult class assignments) and the children taught by the non-trainee beginners in the STINT schools may be considered a positive finding.

This conclusion is qualified of course, by the ex post facto nature of the groups being compared and the lack of clearly defined differences in credentials and assignments. It is important to future evaluations of this program that a basis be established for definitively evaluating its impact on children's achievement.

C. CHILDREN'S ATTENDANCE

Although children in non-Special Service schools attended more regularly, there were no statistically significant differences within the Special Service schools or the non-Special Service schools in the mean percent of days present for children in classes of any of the three groups of teachers. In the context then of the assumption of initial differences in classes to which the STINT trainees were assigned, these data suggest that the trainees had sufficient impact on their children so that they (the children) attended school as regularly as the children in classes of experienced teachers.

D. TEACHER SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

Attendance data were obtained for 691 teachers of whom 244 were STINT trainees, 125 were beginning teachers working in STINT schools though not with the teacher trainer, and 322 were beginning teachers in schools not participating in the program. The overall differences between the groups were slight. The median number of days absent was eight for the trainees and nine for other beginning teachers in STINT schools regardless of whether the schools were designated Special Service or non-Special Service. For the other teachers the median number of days absent was nine for those teaching in Special Service schools and seven for those teaching in non-Special Service schools.

CHAPTER VII

PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM: DISTRICT COORDINATORS AND PRINCIPALS

This chapter presents data on the perceptions of persons connected with the program. The chapter begins with the perceptions of the District Coordinators assigned to the program; continues with the perceptions of the principals of the schools to which the trainers were assigned, the teacher trainers, and concludes with the views of the trainees themselves.

A. PERCEPTIONS OF THE DISTRICT COORDINATORS

There were 27 district coordinators participating in the program. Each one was personally interviewed as part of this evaluation.

1. Professional Background

Four aspects of the background of the district coordinators were examined, including the licenses which the coordinators possessed, their total years of teaching experience, other experiences in the educational system, and the position which they held immediately prior to their present position.

Most of the licenses held were in the elementary school level; 59 percent had common branches licenses and 7 percent had early childhood education licenses. Of the others, 15 percent were qualified to teach junior high school and 7 percent to teach high school. Twelve (14 percent) of the coordinators possessed other miscellaneous licenses, the most common of which was that of assistant principal, held by seven of the 12 remaining coordinators. The second most common license held by these coordinators was that of principal.

Generally, the coordinators had teaching experience in both Special Service and non-Special Service schools, with 25 of the 27 coordinators having had teaching experience in the New York public schools. Of those 25, their years of experience ranged from five years or less (8 percent) to more than 30 years (3 percent).

Twenty-six of the 27 coordinators had experience in the school system outside of teaching, mostly in supervisory positions such as principal or assistant principal (65 percent) and curriculum work (42 percent), and these were the positions they held prior to becoming coordinators.

In addition to their previous work experience, 63 percent of the coordinators reported that they received specialized preparations for their work as STINT coordinators. The type of training most frequently noted was that of STINT orientation conferences (65 percent) and graduate or course work (35 percent).

Almost all of the coordinators reported being notified of their position in STINT between the spring and fall of 1968, half before the summer, half afterwards.

2. The Role of the District Coordinator

Duties of the district coordinator were examined in the terms of the percentage of time devoted to STINT duties and responsibilities of STINT coordinators other than STINT duties. The majority of the coordinators (81 percent) spent less than half of their time on STINT duties, with their responsibilities outside of STINT, primarily supervision (60 percent); curriculum work, as curriculum coordinators and consultants (mainly in the area of remedial reading instruction) (49 percent); or personnel directors (26 percent).[1]

In order to examine the means by which the coordinators performed their STINT duties, the materials and facilities available to the coordinator were studied. Materials most commonly available to coordinators were district office materials (44 percent), materials from the Board of Education (30 percent), and curriculum materials (from the schools and the Board of Education, 26 percent). Eleven percent of the coordinators reported availability of free materials from publishers as well as Center for Urban Education manuals and only 7 percent reported using the STINT guidelines and Teacher Training Manual.

Several criteria were examined related to the actual duties performed by the STINT district coordinator in order to fulfill his responsibilities for the STINT program. First, the coordinator's perception of his own function in the program was examined. This was followed by questioning on specific duties, such as attending coordinator conferences, conducting activities for STINT teacher trainers, visiting of the schools with teacher trainers, and record keeping of activities in the program, such as visits to STINT teacher trainers and of evaluations of STINT teacher trainers.

The coordinator's perception of his own function in the program seemed to fall into three categories: that of a supervisory and structuring function, a liaison function, and a resource function. Although several of the coordinators perceived their role as encompassing more than one of these functions, by far the most prominent of the three was supervisory (67 percent). Thirty percent felt that being a resource person was one of their duties and 22 percent felt that part of their function was to serve as a liaison between the teacher trainer and the district office or Headquarters.

---

[1] Some coordinators reported multiple "other" duties, which accounts for more responses than the total number of coordinators interviewed, and for the percentages totaling more than 100.

The vast majority of coordinators reported having attended between one and five coordinator conferences (70 percent), with most attending between one and three (59 percent). Suggestions for future meetings included more discussions, more materials and demonstrations of method and technique. In addition, some (20 percent), suggested orientation meetings before the school year begins.

When asked whether activities were held for the STINT teacher trainers, the large majority of the coordinators (89 percent) reported that they were held. The activities reported involved conferences, workshops (both within the district and in cooperation with other districts) and special events, typically a guest speaker. The activity most often held was the conference (85 percent of the districts), with the workshop second (56 percent of the districts). Thirty percent of the districts also reported special events, such as guest speakers. The reported frequency of conferences ranged from once a week (5 percent) to once every two months (27 percent), with 22 percent meeting at least twice a month and 37 percent about once a month. In the 15 districts where workshops were held, the most frequent interval for workshops was six to eight weeks (40 percent), while 27 percent held meetings five or fewer times and 20 percent of the districts had workshops every two to three weeks.

The most frequent subjects of discussion in both the conferences and the workshops were curriculum, teaching techniques and materials. These comprised 65 percent of the reported district conferences and 73 percent of the reported district workshops. Administrative, orientation and organizational matters were discussed more often in the workshops (40 percent) than in the conferences (17 percent).

Although a majority of the district supervisors did conduct training activities for the teacher trainers (conferences and workshops), far fewer performed supervisory activities regularly, such as visiting teacher trainers in the schools (33 percent). This is not surprising since all of the district superintendents had other responsibilities besides STINT. Of the nine coordinators who did visit the schools on a regular basis, one visited once or twice a year, two visited once every two months, three visited bi-monthly, one visited weekly at first, but then visited monthly, and two visited weekly. Of the 16 coordinators who gave reasons why they did not visit the schools on a regularly scheduled basis, five said it was up to the principal to supervise the program, four said that they went when they were requested to go rather than on a regularly scheduled basis, and four said there was no time available to visit the schools on a regularly scheduled basis. The remaining three reported miscellaneous reasons.

In terms of the record keeping activities of the coordinators, most of the coordinators kept records on their general activities (78 percent), fewer kept records on their visits to the teacher trainers (67 percent), and the smallest number kept records on evaluations of teacher trainers (41 percent). The two most frequent types of records kept of general activities were records kept of visits, conferences and meetings, and reports from teacher trainers. Visits to the teacher trainers were recorded in log form or on file cards. Occasionally principals submitted records of unsatisfactory progress or the principals kept the records and observation report themselves.

3. Implementation of the Program

Mechanics of the program were investigated in terms of the selection and number of teacher trainers assigned to each school in the district. The three most commonly used methods of selection were recommendation by principal and selection by district superintendent (30 percent), selection by principals (22 percent) and teacher application, then principal and district superintendent selection (30 percent). Two hundred twenty-nine (43 percent) of the total of 533 schools in the participating districts had teacher trainers assigned to them when interviews were held in April; 75 percent were Special Service schools and 25 percent were not Special Service schools, leaving 65 percent of the Special Service schools with teacher trainers as compared with 30 percent of the non-Special Service schools. One hundred seventy-six (76 percent) of the teacher trainers were assigned to the school in which they were teaching and 35 (62 percent) of the remaining 56 trainers were assigned to other schools in their districts. Two hundred six (89 percent) of the teacher trainers were assigned to one school only, while 11 percent were assigned to two schools (26). No teacher trainers were reported to have been assigned to three schools. In the 14 districts where multiple placement was necessary, the primary reason was the lack of available teacher trainers.

In reporting the coordinators' evaluation of the effectiveness of the 232 teacher trainers, it is necessary to note that 39 percent of the trainers had been appointed after February. The others had been teacher trainers since the end of November and, therefore, had worked a maximum of five months at the time of the interview. Within these limits, all criteria were positive: very few of the teacher trainers had been dropped from the program (67 percent of the districts reported no trainers dropped and most others only one); coordinator ratings of the teacher trainers were generally quite high (79 percent of the trainers were rated "very good" or "excellent"); and most would be asked back for next year (83 percent).

4. Attitudes Toward STINT

The coordinators were asked to evaluate the effects of the STINT program on the principals in the district and the attitudes of other personnel toward the STINT program. Principals were said to provide the same assistance and supervision as before the STINT program was installed in 33 percent of the districts and more supervision and assistance than before in 26 percent of the districts. Eleven percent reported that the principals provided less assistance than before.

Coordinators were also asked to estimate the attitude of school and district personnel towards the STINT program. At least 83 percent and as many as 96 percent reported "very favorable" attitudes on the part of the District Superintendent and Curriculum Coordinators, school principals, teacher trainers, trainees, parents and non-teaching school staff. Smaller majorities reported "very favorable" attitudes by teachers other than trainees (63 percent) and by community organizations (71 percent). The group least often rated "very favorable" were the assistants to the principal (48 percent).

5. Overall Evaluation of the Program

The coordinators' view of the general success of the program was estimated by asking the coordinators to rate the effectiveness of the program in the district on a six point scale ranging from "excellent" to "unsatisfactory" and by asking the coordinator to rate the morale of the trainees as compared with beginning teachers of prior years. Responses to both these questions were overwhelmingly favorable. Seventy-two percent of the coordinators rated the program "excellent," 25 percent "very good," and 4 percent "good." As for the morale of the trainees, 95 percent of the coordinators who responded answered that the morale was "much better than in previous years." These findings are particularly impressive when it is recalled that the teachers' strike at the beginning of the school year is accepted as having had a demoralizing effect on all of the people concerned.

Finally, coordinators were asked what were, in their opinion, the strengths and weaknesses of the program and what recommendations they had to improve it. General consensus (88 percent) was that the primary strength of the program was the support which it provided to the teacher trainees, primarily the moral support by a colleague rather than by a supervisor, so that the new teacher did not have to fear an unsatisfactory rating or loss of his job when asking for help. Twenty-one percent of the coordinators listed the good demonstration of teaching techniques as the main strength of the program. They cited the following as weaknesses of the program: inadequate staffing (58 percent), including the need for more teacher trainers, a full time district coordinator, and a full year of internship for new teachers; poor communication (38 percent), including lack of time for trainer-trainee and district coordinator-trainer meetings and the need for orientation conferences; role conflict (19 percent) produced by the position of the teacher trainer who, in a semi-supervisory function, had the tendency to impinge on the roles of the assistant principal and principal. Suggestions for improving the program consisted primarily of remedying these conditions.

B. PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

1. Source of Data

The data for this portion of the report were obtained from interviews with 210 principals of schools to which a STINT teacher trainer had been assigned on either a full or part-time basis. Principals' perceptions of various aspects of the program, the teacher trainer, and the trainees were elicited in the Interview Guide for School Principals.

2. Supportive Services Provided by Teacher Trainer

Principals were asked to indicate the extent to which the teacher trainer provided "continuous and effective support" to the trainees in various areas. Overall, there was a consistently positive evaluation. More than 80 percent of the principals rated the support as both effective and continuous in reading (both in methodology and selecting curriculum), and in room management and discipline, and two-thirds gave this rating to the support provided in the methodology and curriculum in mathematics, and half in Social Studies and Science.

These impressions of the principals were corroborated by the STINT trainees, who were also asked to rate the extent and quality of the supportive service which they recieved in these same areas. The trainees also reported that the most effective support was provided in areas of reading (curriculum and methodology), and classroom management and discipline. However, the principals as a whole were more positive in their ratings than were the trainees.

3. Principal Ratings of Teacher Trainers

The principals interviewed were all requested to rate the teacher trainers serving in their school in terms of their interpersonal relationships, teaching ability, personal attributes and overall effectiveness, using a five-point scale ranging from "excellent" to "poor." As Table VII-1 shows, the principals' ratings were generally high: 80-97 percent of them rated their teacher trainer as being "superior" or "excellent" in each of the areas. The STINT trainers' relationships with other teachers received the lowest rating and proportion of "excellent" or "superior" ratings (80 percent), possibly because of principal-trainer role conflicts.

Additional insight into the positive view of the principals is the finding that 94 percent of the principals would request the same STINT teacher trainer for next year. The reasons most often cited were the trainers' professional competence, general effectiveness and personal attributes, the same characteristics considered the major strengths of the STINT teacher trainer.

TABLE VII-1

PRINCIPALS' EVALUATION OF TEACHER TRAINERS IN THEIR SCHOOLS, BY PERCENT

Area	N	Excellent	Superior	Good	Fair	Poor
1. Interpersonal Relationships						
with supervisors	210	72	15	10	3	1
with trainees	209	57	27	13	3	0
with other teachers	205	52	28	15	5	0
with parents	179	60	22	15	2	1
with children	203	60	25	8	1	1
with auxiliary personnel	201	60	26	12	1	0
2. Teaching Ability						
classroom teaching	202	66	25	8	1	0
classroom demonstration lessons	201	61	30	7	1	0
teacher training workshops	190	59	27	18	2	1
3. Personal Attributes						
energy	207	67	22	11	0	0
alertness	207	72	25	7	1	1
adaptability	208	62	25	10	2	1
professional attitude	208	75	19	4	1	1
appearance	210	70	21	7	1	0
4. Overall Effectiveness	206	57	33	9	1	0

Half of the 187 principals who responded to this question found no "major weaknesses" in their teacher trainers. Another 20 percent felt the weakness of the teacher trainer stemmed from the administrative problems of the program in that they could not concentrate their efforts within one school. Only 15 percent based their criticism of the teacher trainers on personal attributes such as rigidity, which caused conflict with other teachers.

4. Principals' Evaluation of STINT Trainees

The principals were asked to compare the STINT trainees with other beginning teachers in four areas: sensitivity to children's needs, ability to deal with problems arising in ghetto classrooms, their morale, and their overall rating as teachers. On these questions large numbers of principals were unwilling or felt unable to make these comparisons and the number who did respond is indicated in each instance.

Approximately two-thirds of 154 principals responding reported that the STINT trainees were "more sensitive and aware" of the emotional and learning needs of the children than were other beginning teachers. Almost all (98 percent) of the 98 principals willing to conjecture about cause attributed the trainees' greater competence in these areas at least in part to the STINT program.

In terms of morale, 68 percent of the principals (N = 161) rated the STINT trainees as having "much better" or "somewhat better" morale than other beginning teachers and the remaining principals felt morale was the same for the two groups. However, only 30 percent of the principals (N = 183) felt the morale of the school was "much" or "somewhat better" than the previous year, 36 percent felt the morale was the same, and 34 percent felt the overall school morale was worse than in previous years. This finding may be attributed to the Teachers' Strike in the fall of 1968, with the improved morale of the STINT trainees not sufficient to improve that of the school in general.

The principals were asked to rate the overall teaching ability of the STINT trainees and the typical beginning teachers on a six point scale. Considering the mean percentages, the distributions of ratings were very similar (trainees N = 183, beginning teachers N = 143) both at the extremes (26 percent of the trainees and 21 percent of beginning teachers rated "excellent" or "very good," 11 percent of the trainees and 15 percent of the beginning teachers judged "poor" or "unsatisfactory") and in the center; a third of both trainees and beginning teachers rated "good" and a third rated "fair."

5. Supervision of Trainees

When asked to estimate the frequency of supervision by principal or assistant to the principal, 63 percent of the principals indicated that STINT trainees (N = 198) and other beginning teachers (N = 166) both recieved supervision once a week or more. The trainees received supervision from the teacher trainers as well. Therefore, principals reported that trainees did get more supervision than did non-STINT beginning teachers.

6. Principals' Perceptions of Attitudes of Others Towards STINT

Principals were asked for their opinions of the attitudes held toward STINT by district and school staff as well as parents and community organizations. In all cases except for teachers other than trainees, at least three-fourths and as many as 93 percent of the principals responding (N = 85 to 196) indicated that they believed these groups to hold "very favorable" attitudes toward the program. Only 60 percent of the principals responding (N = 171) said that the "other teachers" held "very favorable" attitudes toward the program. Indications of even slightly negative attitudes were never reported by more than 4 percent of the principals.

7. Principals' Evaluation of the STINT Program

The principals were unanimous in their positive perception of the overall effectiveness of the program. Eighty-three percent rated the program as either "excellent" or "very good" and the remaining 17 percent rated it as "good" or "fair." None of the principals utilized ratings of either "poor" or "unsatisfactory." The strengths of the program most frequently mentioned by the principals consisted of the availability of the trainer to provide continuous, full-time supportive services to the teacher. Next often mentioned as a strength of the program was the effectiveness of the trainers and their ability as teachers. In addition, when principals were asked to specify the weaknesses of the program, almost half specifically stated that they felt there were no weaknesses, and of those indicating weaknesses, the kinds of weaknesses mentioned were disparate and presumably unique to each school. The recommendations most frequently mentioned were the need for trainers on a full-time basis (22 percent), orientation programs for the teacher trainer (16 percent), more trainers (12 percent), and clarification of roles (8 percent) particularly between the assistant principals and the teacher trainers.

CHAPTER VIII

PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM: STINT TEACHER TRAINEES

A. SOURCE OF DATA

The data for this portion of the report were obtained from a sample of 275 beginning teachers who responded to the Teacher Questionnaire. For this analysis teachers were grouped according to whether they were STINT trainees or not. The respondents (trainees and non-trainees) were then separated into those teaching in Special Service and non-Special Service schools. In the main, the perceptions of both of these groups were the same and consequently were reported together; where differences between these groups were found, they were reported as such.

The reader is reminded that the low proportion of respondents for this questionnaire requires us to interpret these data as suggestive, rather than conclusive.

B. BACKGROUND AND PREPARATION

The first part of the questionnaire dealt with the teacher's background and preparation for teaching. Approximately two-thirds (N = 176) of the teachers responding had regular licenses. The group of STINT trainees in Special Service schools contained lower proportions of regularly licensed teachers (55 percent) compared to the trainees in non-Special Service schools (73 percent). Seventy-six percent of the teachers who were not trainees had regular licenses. Eighty-seven percent were graduates of intensive teacher education programs, or had taken the professional courses required to qualify for the substitute license.[1]

C. PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEACHER TRAINER BY TRAINEES

When asked specifically to rate their teacher trainer, the majority chose the superlative ratings most frequently. At least half of the trainees considered their trainer to have "excellent" or "superior" interpersonal relationships. Two of every three trainees thought their trainer had "excellent" relationships with the trainees, pupils and auxiliary school personnel.

---

[1] It should be noted that these findings do not imply that most of the trainees were regular teachers, but rather that more regular teachers responded to this questionnaire. In fact, other data obtained from the school organization sheets indicated that the majority of the trainees were substitute teachers.

The trainees were also highly impressed with the trainers' personal attributes. More than half found the trainers' energy, alertness, flexibility, professional attitude and appearance to be of the highest calibre.

D. SELF-APPRAISAL OF TEACHER COMPETENCE AND INFLUENCE OF TEACHER TRAINER

Beginning teachers, both STINT trainees and those not working directly with a teacher trainer, were asked to rate their competence in each of 28 aspects of instructional and interpersonal functioning. A similar questionnaire was administered to participants in the 1967 Intensive Teacher Training Program (ITTP) and to a group of regular beginning teachers from conventional teacher education programs as part of the evaluation conducted by the Center for Urban Education.

Table VIII-1 gives the proportions of the above average ratings for all groups on each aspect. Trainees working in Special Service and non-Special Service schools did not differ greatly in their self-appraisals; the only exception was their competence in the use of special services in the school such as guidance. (Thirty-six percent of the trainees in Special Service schools considered themselves "above average" in this area whereas 61 percent of those working in non-Special Service schools felt this way.) Therefore as mentioned above the two groups will be combined for further analysis.

In comparison to graduates of the short term teacher education program, for 18 of the 19 possible comparisons a higher proportion of STINT trainees considered their competence "above average." Similarly, higher proportions of beginning teachers not working with a teacher trainer also considered themselves "above average" in 18 of the 19 comparisons. The one exception for the trainees was the "use of special services in the school such as guidance," and for the other beginning teachers, it was "teacher-principal relationships." The high self-appraisals of the other beginning teachers in the STINT schools may again reflect the "spillover" effect, for many of the beginning teachers worked in schools that participated in the STINT program, although they themselves were not assigned directly to a teacher trainer. The proportion of above average ratings did not differ greatly for the trainees and the other beginning teachers.

In comparison to the regular beginning teachers of the ITTP study, a significantly higher proportion of STINT trainees estimated their competence to be "above average" in general methods of teaching (72 percent versus 48 percent), methods of teaching reading (67 percent versus 44 percent), and methods of teaching math (67 percent versus 44 percent). The proportion of teachers in the two groups rating themselves "above average" did not differ by more than 10 percent in the other areas of teacher functioning.

The areas in which at least three-fourths of the trainees

TABLE VIII-1

PROPORTIONS OF ABOVE AVERAGE RATINGS OF SELF-APPRAISALS ON ASPECTS OF TEACHING FOR STINT TRAINEES (N=197), NON-STINT BEGINNING TEACHERS (N=78), ITTP GRADUATES (N=75), AND PROPORTIONS OF TRAINEES ATTRIBUTING COMPETENCE COMPLETELY OR CONSIDERABLY TO TEACHER TRAINERS

Aspect	STINT Trainees	Non-Trainee Beginning Teachers	ITTP Graduates	Regular Beginning Teachers	Proportion Who Attribute Competency to Teacher Trainer
Teacher-coworker relationships	90	94	70	96	26
Teacher-paraprofessional relationships	88	78			23
Teacher (trainee)-teacher trainer relationships	84	48			70
Pupil teacher relationships	82	95	80	88	24
Understanding children's behavior	80	86	68	79	28
Self-evaluation: (strengths and weaknesses)	79	78			39
Clerical tasks, i.e., roll books	77	78	61	86	48
Teacher-principal relationships	77	61	64	78	21
Parent-teacher relationships	77	86	72	88	29
Planning lessons: daily, weekly, unit, term	73	67	59	65	29
General methods of teaching	72	66	5[illegible]	48	43

TABLE VIII-1 (continued)

Aspect	STINT Trainees	Non-Trainee Beginning Teachers	ITTP Graduates	Regular Beginning Teachers	Proportion Who Attribute Competency to Teacher Trainer
School-community relations	72	81			21
Expectations of pupil achievement	70	70			36
Routines of class and classroom management	70	71	60	72	32
Professional relations, i.e., organizations	68	64	42	71	30
Methods of teaching reading	67	57	50	44	58
Motivating a class	66	76	57	69	40
Questioning techniques	64	77			35
Providing for individual differences	61	56	52	66	32
Discipline in the classroom	60	70	54	66	46
Use of instructional materials	59	54	46	62	38
Methods of teaching math	55	66	25	46	38
Evaluation of learning, test grades, etc.	51	67	46	53	20
Group activities, large and small	51	49			30

TABLE VIII-1 (continued)

Aspect	STINT Trainees	Non-Trainee Beginning Teachers	ITTP Graduates	Regular Beginning Teachers	Proportion Who Attribute Competency to Teacher Trainer
Development of instructional materials	47	63			47
Special services in the school, i.e., guidance	47	65	63	66	36
New educational media, i.e., programed instruction	40	47	16	37	37
Providing for the exceptional child	39	43			27

estimated their competency to be "above average" were "understanding children's behavior," "clerical tasks," "interpersonal relationships," and their overall self-evaluation. Three-fourths of the control teachers also felt "above average" in "motivating a class," and "questioning techniques."

The trainees estimated their greatest weakness to be their lack of familiarity with new educational media, where 25 percent rated their competence in this area to be below average. Fewer than 12 percent of the trainees considered themselves "below average" in each of the remaining areas.

The STINT trainees were asked to judge the influence of the teacher trainer on their competence in these areas. The areas where the trainees felt less confident, and had a need for assistance, were the areas in which the largest proportion of trainees attributed their present ability either "completely" or "considerably" to the help received from the teacher trainer.

The effectiveness of the teacher trainer was focused mainly on methodology, areas in which the trainees felt most weak. Forty-three percent of the trainees attributed their competence in general methods of teaching "completely" or "considerably" to the STINT teacher trainer, as did 58 percent in methods of teaching reading; 46 percent in discipline; and 47 percent in development of instructional materials.

The trainees were also asked to consider whether they were more effective in the classroom as a result of having worked with a STINT teacher trainer (50 percent responded "definitely yes," 28 percent answered "probably yes"). Of those who attributed their effectiveness to the teacher trainer, 39 percent based their conclusions on the "general supportive help" offered; 23 percent felt the "particular methods and techniques" were important; and 14 percent considered the "interpersonal relationship" and the "encouragement" helpful. Of those who responded negatively, the most frequently cited reason was the "lack of availability" of the teacher trainer.

The trainees were also asked to consider whether they were better able to deal with the learning and emotional problems that arise in a classroom of children from a poverty area as a result of the STINT program.[2] Two of every three trainees believed that they were more capable of teaching in such classrooms as a result of working with a teacher trainer.

Of those trainees who responded negatively, the most frequent reason stated was that they knew the children and community well and did not need assistance in this area.

---

[2] Improving this ability was a specific objective of the program.

E. EXTENT AND QUALITY OF SUPERVISION

The STINT trainees' contact with the STINT teacher trainer was reported to be frequent. The greatest proportion, more than two-thirds of the STINT trainees (70 percent), reported receiving assistance once a week or more often, and about the same proportion (73 percent) found the assistance to be at least "frequently" helpful and constructive. The staff with whom the trainees had the next most contact was experienced teachers in the school. This contact was a third as frequent as that existing between the trainee and the STINT teacher trainer. One-fourth of the trainees (26 percent) said they had contact with experienced teachers once a week. The quality of assistance given by experienced teachers was rated by approximately half of the trainees as at least "frequently" helpful. There was no significant difference between the percent of STINT trainees and non-STINT beginning teachers who received assistance from experienced teachers. Thus these data suggest that the teacher trainer did not decrease the extent of supervision of STINT trainees by other staff members.

When questioned about the availability of on-the-job immediate help when it was needed, approximately the same proportion of STINT trainees and non-STINT beginning teachers reported receiving assistance when and where it was needed. Ninety-six percent of the trainees said they received immediate assistance at least "sometimes" as did 91 percent of the non-STINT beginning teachers. Most trainees indicated that they received this help from the STINT teacher trainer, next most often from the assistant principal. The pattern for the non-STINT beginning teachers indicated they received such assistance and supervision from experienced teachers.

F. TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED

Table VIII-2 lists the techniques suggested for use by the teacher trainers in the materials supplied by the central staff of STINT.

According to the trainees, the techniques most often utilized (74 to 86 percent) by the STINT trainers were individual conferences, grade conferences with supervisors, follow-up conferences after demonstration lessons, individual and group planning, and the use of instructional equipment. The techniques least often used (13 to 30 percent) were intervisitations and observations of other teachers.

G. EFFECTIVENESS OF TECHNIQUES

The techniques mentioned as employed by at least three-fourths of the trainees were also considered by at least 53 percent of the trainees to be "very successful" or "quite successful" with the exception of grade conferences with supervisors. Only 26 percent of the trainees rated this aspect of the trainer's functioning as at

TABLE VIII-2

UTILIZATION OF TEACHER TRAINING TECHNIQUES AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS BY TRAINEES IN PERCENT

	Technique Used	Effectiveness
Individual conferences	86	65
Individual planning	83	56
Cooperative planning in pairs and groups	82	53
Grade conferences with supervisors	81	26
Use of instructional equipment	79	65
Demonstration lessons with follow-up conferences	74	61
Grade conferences on goals and expectations	72	33
Grade conferences on curriculum and materials	72	32
Demonstration lessons with trainee's class	71	64
Curriculum area study; materials for the curriculum	63	33
Demonstration lessons, preplanning with trainees	62	65
Group conferences	62	48
Workshops in methods and procedures	57	54
Workshops in development of instructional materials and techniques	56	61
Planning for individual children	56	50
Conferences in self-evaluation by trainees	56	68
Use of films and tapes of lessons for analyses and discussion	53	58
Microteaching: skills and techniques	53	51
Microteaching: whole class	52	51
Curriculum area study: consultants and specialists	50	40
Microteaching: methods and materials	49	50
Workshops: room and display materials	49	65
Workshops: curriculum study	49	54
Workshops: plan and plan book organization	48	68
Curriculum area study: curriculum coordinators	44	25
Microteaching in small groups	43	50
Intervisitation with experienced teachers	43	48
Conferences: discussions of common lesson observations with groups of trainees	42	62
Intervisitation with other trainees	30	58
Observation of other teachers; follow-up conferences without observed teacher present	21	51
Observation of other teachers; follow-up conferences with observed teacher present	20	53
Video-taped observations of other teachers	16	54
Observation of other teacher; preplanning before observation	13	71

least "quite successful."

In addition, more than 60 percent of the trainees rated demonstration lessons, workshops, conferences for self-evaluation and for discussing lesson observations, and preplanning before observations of other teachers, as at least "quite successful."

H. EXTENT AND QUALITY OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICE

The teachers were asked to indicate the extent and quality of supportive services provided them by all staff in curriculum, methodology and class control.

As can be seen on Table VIII-3, a greater proportion of STINT trainees reported receiving "continuous effective support" in every area compared to the non-STINT beginning teachers. In the area of reading, curriculum and methodology, half the trainees reported continuous effective support compared to less than a third of the non-STINT beginning teachers who indicated the same. About twice as many STINT trainees as non-STINT beginning teachers indicated continuous effective support in the areas of math and social studies, curriculum and methodology. In the area of science, curriculum and methodology, the percentage differences were the smallest but somewhat higher proportions of STINT trainees still indicated continuous effective support.

I. TEACHER ATTITUDES

Teachers were asked to indicate their present feeling about various aspects of teaching and to indicate whether their present attitude had undergone any change during the year. Table VIII-4 presents the percent of teachers who responded that their present attitude was either "generally" or "completely" positive and the proportion who indicated that their attitude had changed in a positive direction during the school year.

Differences between STINT and non-STINT beginning teachers were negligible in ratings of present attitude. For most aspects, the modal response category was the positive ratings presented in the table.

The items "teaching in general" and "self-confidence" were rated positive by the highest proportions of teachers, while "working with children with a physical style of learning" and "working with behavior problems" had the smallest proportions of teachers responding positively (and the highest proportions of teachers responding negatively).

In terms of change, it should first be noted that the modal response category in all aspects except "self-confidence" was "no change" in attitudes (a category not presented in the table).

TABLE VIII-3

PERCENT RECEIVING CONTINUOUS EFFECTIVE SUPPORT BY AREA

	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beginning Teachers
Reading (Curriculum)	51	31
Reading (Methodology)	48	29
Math (Curriculum)	36	17
Math (Methodology)	32	16
Social Studies (Curriculum)	30	20
Social Studies (Methodology)	31	16
Science (Curriculum)	26	24
Science (Methodology)	23	17
Room Management	44	29
Discipline	45	31

TABLE VIII-4

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS WITH POSITIVE ATTITUDES [illegible] VARIOUS ASPECTS

	Completely or Generally Positive Present Attitude		Positive Changes During the Past School Year	
Aspects	STINT Trainees N=197	Non-STINT Trainees N=78	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Trainees
Teaching in general	81	87	30	21
Teaching in urban schools	65	74	19	22
Working with students from low socio-economic background	74	68	38	30
Working with students from middle socio-economic background	65	61	13	11
Working with students from high socio-economic background	50	39	7	10
Working with children who learn very quickly	76	79	21	20
Working with children who learn slowly	64	59	23	19
Working with children who have a physical style of learning	44	42	12	8
Working with children with behavior problems	30	28	20	11
Your feeling of self-confidence as a teacher	85	88	59	48

Although for eight of the ten aspects STINT trainees had somewhat higher proportions of teachers indicating change in a positive direction than did non-STINT beginning teachers these percentage differences for specific items were minimal. Most often (59 percent of the STINT teachers and 48 percent of the non-STINT beginning teachers) positive change was reported in "self-confidence." Attitudes toward teaching children from low socio-economic background and to teaching in general were the next frequently noted positive changes.

When asked to rate the morale of the STINT trainees as compared with that of other beginning teachers who had not received assistance from the STINT teacher trainer, one-half of the trainees responding stated that the morale of the STINT trainees was "somewhat" or "much better" than that of the non-STINT beginning teachers. Of the remaining half all but 3 percent of the responding teachers indicated that the morale was "about the same" in both cases.

J. OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS

Asked about the overall effectiveness of the STINT program in their school, 71 percent of the teachers felt that the program was either "good" (18 percent), "very good" (25 percent), or "excellent" (28 percent). Fifteen percent rated the overall effectiveness as "fair," and 7 percent each as "poor" or "unsatisfactory."

Content analysis of the questionnaires where the respondents indicated "fair," "poor," or "unsatisfactory" was quite revealing. Most of the responses pointed to how the teacher trainer was overburdened with too many trainees and too little time to give all help needed or cases where teachers did not like the teacher trainer but felt that the program could be effective with a good trainer. Therefore, even when the trainees were less than enthusiastic about the program, it was because they felt that it was not functioning well enough to satisfy their needs, rather than a denial of the value or need for a program of assistance to new teachers.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. ROLE OF THE TEACHER TRAINER

Information concerning the job of the teacher trainer was obtained from interviews with 198 teacher trainers and questionnaires returned by 191 teacher trainers.

Most of the trainers wished to participate in the program for reasons categorized as the wish to "help others," and the "challenge of taking part in a new program." Slightly under two out of three trainers had, at some point in their overall preparation, received specialized preparation in teacher training or supervision. The most frequent type of training received was experience as a cooperating teacher.

For the most part (80 percent) the trainees were selected by principals, on the basis of being new and inexperienced (81 percent). Eighteen percent of the teacher trainees reported being consulted in the selection process, and the remaining 2 percent said there was no selection, all new teachers were automatically designated as trainees.

Consequently, not all of the trainees with whom the trainers worked were new teachers. Those trainees who were not new teachers were appointed as trainees primarily due to weakness in teaching skills, or length of teaching experience being less than one year. The average number of trainees assigned per teacher trainer was between six to ten.

Most of the teacher trainers devoted all their working time to the program. However, occasionally, principals requested that they perform other tasks. This occurred seven times more frequently with teacher trainers in Special Service schools than in non-Special Service schools. The duties performed by teacher trainers who did not devote all of their time to STINT were mostly of a supervisory nature, assisting the principal or the assistant principal in work with other teachers.

About half (55 percent) of the teacher trainers reported that materials were especially provided for their role as teacher trainers. The Teacher Training Manual from the Board of Education was most frequently mentioned (40 percent), although curriculum bulletins were also mentioned by a substantial number of trainers (36 percent).

Space and office facilities were a problem. Private offices were available to only one out of five trainers. Almost half (47 percent) of the trainers shared a room with one other person. Remaining trainers reported either sharing a room with from two to four other school personnel (11 percent), having a desk as their only facility (7 percent), or having no space at all at which to work (21 percent).

Methodological techniques most frequently used (by at least four out of five trainers), in order of frequency of use, were: individual conferences, individual planning, pre-planning demonstration lessons, demonstrating lessons with the trainee's class, and follow-up conferences on demonstration lessons. More than half of the trainers visited trainees in their classrooms on a standard schedule, for the most part three times per week. Approximately four out of five of those who did not visit on a regularly scheduled basis visited when assistance was requested by the teacher trainees. On an average, 25 percent of the week of the trainer was spent working directly with teachers.

All of the above techniques (most frequently employed by the trainers) were rated "very successful" or "quite successful" by at least four out of five trainers. Other techniques less frequently used were also rated as highly by four out of five trainers: use of instructional equipment (audio-visual, flannel boards, etc.), micro teaching (practice of skills and techniques, practice with small groups, and with the whole class), workshops in method and procedure, group conferences, and pre-planning before observation by other teachers.

Problems were generally very effectively dealt with. Only one of the five problems which were considered serious by more than half of the trainers in the first half of the year remained so in the second half of the year. This problem was that of discipline, and only two out of five trainers felt that they were effective in helping teachers deal with it. Over half of the teacher trainers felt that they were effective in helping teachers cope with the other initially serious problems: routines of classroom management, methods of teaching reading, general methods of teaching, and planning of lessons.

When teacher trainers were asked to rate the morale of the trainees as compared with other beginning teachers, responses indicated a belief that morale of the trainees was "much better" or "somewhat better" than that of other beginning teachers. Other school personnel also were positively disposed towards the program according to the perceptions of the teacher trainers. The attitudes of large majorities (61 percent to 96 percent) of almost all district and school staff were seen as "very favorably" oriented to the program.

Almost every teacher trainer (97 percent) reported that he would like to continue work as a teacher trainer next year. Ninety-three percent wanted to continue in the school to which they were now assigned.

The strengths of the program most frequently mentioned were the ability of the trainee to ask for help from a peer (45 percent), the provision for practical assistance in such areas as curriculum, methodology, discipline, motivation and methods (44 percent), and the improved morale of the trainees (43 percent).

The most pronounced weaknesses of the program, according to the teacher trainers, were the lack of adequate facilities and space (58 percent), the overload of work for the trainer (23 percent), role conflict with the assistant principal (23 percent), and the lack of coordination of free time of the teacher trainees (18 percent).

Finally, teacher trainers were asked to rate the general effectiveness of the STINT program on a six-point scale, ranging from excellent to unsatisfactory. Responses fell generally into the "excellent" (30 percent), "very good" (39 percent), and "good" (27 percent) categories.

B. THE EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM FUNCTIONING

The data on the in-class performance of teachers were obtained by sending professional educators to visit the classes of a sample of the trainees and non-STINT beginning teachers in the same schools as the trainees. The ratings obtained for the STINT trainees were compared to ratings obtained for four other groups of teachers: 1. non-STINT beginning teachers in STINT schools; 2. beginning substitute teachers observed in the Spring of 1968 during the evaluation of the Intensive Teacher Training Program; 3. beginning regularly appointed teachers observed during this same evaluation; and 4. a mixed group of beginning and experienced teachers observed in the Spring of 1968 during the evaluation of the More Effective Schools program.

All of the groups compared were observed and rated in various aspects of their teaching behavior using the ILOR. The instrument was divided into three major areas: teacher functioning, teacher-pupil interaction, and teacher characteristics.

In all three areas the distribution of the ratings for the trainees was positive, with the modal ratings average or above. In the area of teacher functioning the observers reported that they saw lessons that were above average in the overall quality of instruction, as well as in planning, organization, and achievement of objectives. The overall teacher-pupil relationship was rated above average for almost all of the trainees, as was the overall relationship among the children. Approximately half of the trainees were also viewed as being above average in maturity and self-confidence.

Across all three areas, the pattern of ratings assigned trainees was significantly more positive than that of the beginning substitute teachers (ITTP graduates), but did not differ from any of the other three comparison groups. This suggests that the STINT trainees reached a level of functioning no different from the other beginning teachers who had also completed a regular teacher education program.

C. SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM

This information was obtained from the 254 school organization sheets submitted by teacher trainers to the evaluation staff, and corroborated in 198 completed teacher trainer interviews. These data indicated that at least about three thousand (2,965) teachers were designated as trainees to be assisted by the STINT teacher trainers. In addition, almost three of every four trainers in Special Service schools reported that additional teachers, other than the trainees, called for assistance, as did two of every three trainers in non-Special Service schools. Thus a conservative estimate would be that between 3,000 and 4,000 new teachers received some assistance as a consequence of the introduction of the teacher trainers.

Throughout the year, slightly more than one-tenth of the trainees gained sufficient proficiency for the teacher trainer to discontinue working with them. There were somewhat fewer reported in this group from Special Service schools than non-Special Service schools.

The trainees included teachers of grades pre-K to six, as well as OTPs, teachers of the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed, to mention just a few. The grade most often taught was third, with second and fourth closely following.

Using an average of 30 children in a class, approximately 90,000 children whose teachers were trainees were reached directly by the STINT program, with the several thousand children in the classes of the other teachers assisted also reached to some extent.

D. CHILDREN'S ACHIEVEMENT

Reading achievement data were analyzed for children in 150 fourth-grade classes in 33 STINT schools. Sixty-five of these classes were taught by STINT trainees, 25 by beginning teachers who were not assigned a trainer and 60 by other, presumably experienced, teachers in the schools.

No differences were found between children taught by STINT trainees and those taught by non-STINT beginning teachers in either Special Service or non-Special Service schools, though children of both groups of beginning teachers did less well than children of experienced teachers (the median ranged between .6 and .8 of a year).

Further analysis of these data indicated that a consistent majority (typically at least 80 percent) of the children were reading below grade level. Here too, the differences between children taught by STINT trainees and non-STINT beginning teachers was negligible.

Chi-square tests revealed no significant differences between the distribution of scores of childr[illegible] of STINT trainees and children of non-STINT beginning teachers. However, there were significant differences between the distributions of children of STINT trainees and experienced teachers in both Special Service and non-Special Service schools.

It was concluded that because teacher trainers were undoubtedly assigned to teachers with the least adequate teacher preparation as well as to teachers who were teaching the lowest achieving children on the grade, these findings might possibly be interpreted in a positive light.

E. CHILDREN'S ATTENDANCE

In both Special and non-Special Service schools attendance rates were comparable for the children taught by all three groups of teachers studied: the experienced teachers, the trainees, and non-trainee new teachers. In the context then of the assumption of initial differences in classes to which the STINT trainees were assigned, these data suggest that the trainees had sufficient impact on their classes so that the children attended school as regularly as the children in classes of experienced teachers.

F. TEACHER ATTENDANCE

Teacher school attendance rates were not different among the three groups of teachers: both the 244 STINT trainees and 125 non-STINT beginning teachers in STINT schools had attendance records comparable to those of the 322 control teachers in schools not participating in the program. The median number of days absent was eight for the trainees, nine for other beginning teachers in STINT schools, and eight for the other teachers in non-STINT schools.

G. PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM

1. District Coordinator

All 27 district coordinators participating in the program were personally interviewed.

The role of the coordinator in the program was limited due to the fact that they all had additional duties and responsibilities other than their position in STINT, and consequently typically devoted less than half of their time to the program. Sixty-seven percent of the coordinators saw their role in the program as primarily supervisory, less often as a resource (30 percent) or liaison (22 percent) person. Within this supervisory function, 85 percent reported holding conferences and workshops for the teacher trainers with some regularity, devoted to curriculum, teaching techniques and materials. Typically only 33 percent visited the trainers regularly. Sixty-seven percent reported keeping records of the activities of the trainers; and fewer (41 percent) kept formal evaluations of the work of the trainers. Their informal impressions of the trainers were highly positive and they felt they would want the same trainers back were the program to be continued in their district.

At least 83 percent and as many as 96 percent perceived "very favorable" attitudes towards the program on the part of the District Superintendent and Curriculum Coordinators, school principals, teacher trainers, trainees, parents and non-teaching school staff. The group least often rated "very favorable" were the assistants to the principal (48 percent).

They did not perceive any consistent effect of the program on the pattern of help and supervision provided the trainees by persons other than the teacher trainers. When asked about the strengths of the program, 88 percent saw the main strength of the program in the support it provided for the trainees, particularly support which came from someone not in an administrative or supervisory relationship to the trainee; 21 percent considered the demonstration of good teaching technique as an important feature, as were the possibilities for innovation and the freeing of the assistant-to-principal for other duties. The weaknesses reported (and suggested solutions) involved inadequate staffing (58 percent wanted more trainers and full-time coordinators); poor communication (38 percent suggested more conferences between all levels of staff in the program); and 19 percent wanted the interrelationships between the roles of the trainer, the assistant-to-principal,and the principal clarified to minimize any conflict in roles.

The coordinators' response to the overall effectiveness of the program was overwhelmingly favorable. Seventy-two percent rated the program "excellent," 25 percent "very good," and 4 percent "good." They also reported that the morale of the trainees was "much better" than that of beginning teachers in previous years.

2. School Principals

The principals of 210 schools to which a teacher trainer was assigned were personally interviewed. Principals' perceptions of various aspects of the program, the teacher trainer, and the trainees were elicited in the Interview Guide for School Principals.

The supportive services provided by the teacher trainer to the trainees was generally considered "continuous and effective." More than 80 percent of the principals rated the support as both effective and continuous in reading (both in methodology and curriculum), and in room management and discipline, and two-thirds gave this rating to the support provided in the methodology and curriculum in mathematics, and half in social studies and science.

The principals generally thought highly of the teacher trainers: 80 to 97 percent of them rated their teacher trainer as being "superior" or "excellent." Ninety-four percent of the principals reported that they would request the same STINT teacher trainer for next year. The reasons most often cited were the trainers' professional competence, general effectiveness and personal attributes, the same characteristics considered the major strengths of the STINT teacher trainer.

Few major weaknesses were reported by the principals. The most common weakness cited by 20 percent of the principals was having a teacher trainer assigned to more than one school, and thereby dividing her efforts. Only 15 percent based their criticism on personal attributes such as rigidity.

Principals felt that the trainees derived considerable benefit from the program in many areas important to teaching success. Approximately two-thirds of the 154 principals responding to this question reported that the STINT trainees were "more sensitive and aware" of the emotional and learning needs of the children than were other beginning teachers. In all but one instance this greater competence was attributed to the STINT program. Sixty-eight percent of the 161 principals responding felt that the STINT trainees had "much better" or "somewhat better" morale than other beginning teachers. The remaining principals felt morale was the same for the two groups. When compared to the typical beginning teacher in overall teaching ability, the mean percentages of ratings of the STINT trainees were similarly distributed.

The attitudes toward STINT held by the district and school staff as well as by parents and community organizations were perceived by at least three-fourths and as many as 93 percent of the principals as being very favorable. The only exception was for teachers other than trainees where only 60 percent were perceived as being favorably inclined toward the program.

Perhaps the clearest indication of the principals' enthusiasm was in response to the overall effectiveness of the program where they were unanimous in their favorable opinions. Eighty-three percent rated the program as either excellent or very good, 17 percent as good or fair, and none as poor or unsatisfactory. The strength of the program most frequently mentioned by principals was the availability of the trainer to provide continuous, full-time supportive services to the teacher. While almost half stated that there were no weaknesses in the program, and those mentioned were disparate and unique to each school, the recommendation made most frequently (22 percent) was for the need for a full-time teacher trainer.

3. STINT Trainees

These data were obtained from the responses to a questionnaire for a sample of 275 beginning teachers, 197 of whom were STINT trainees.

The trainees were generally very favorably inclined toward all phases of the program, in part reflecting their appraisal of the teacher trainer with whom they worked.

Indeed, when asked specifically to rate their teacher trainer the majority chose the superlative ratings most frequently. At least half of the trainees considered their trainer to have excellent or superior interpersonal relationships. Two of every three trainees thought their trainer had excellent relationships with the trainees, pupils and auxiliary school personnel. The trainees were also highly impressed with the trainers' personal attributes; more than half found the trainers' energy, alertness, flexibility, and professional attitude to be of the highest calibre.

On a scale requesting the teachers to estimate their current competence in various areas critical to teaching, more than about half of the STINT trainees considered themselves to have above average competence in almost all of the areas. When compared to the self-appraisals of other groups of beginning teachers, more of the trainees judged themselves competent in one of every three aspects. The most outstanding differences were in methods of teaching reading and general methods of teaching. Almost all of the trainees attributed their high level of functioning in these areas to the assistance provided by the teacher trainer. The areas where the trainees felt less confident, and had a need for assistance, were the areas in which the largest proportions of trainees attributed their present ability either "completely" or "considerably" to the help received from the teacher trainer. Fifty-eight percent of the trainees attributed their competence in methods of teaching reading to the STINT teacher trainer, as did 43 percent in general methods of teaching; 46 percent in discipline; and 47 percent in development of instructional materials.

Seventy-eight percent of the trainees believed themselves to be generally more effective in the classroom as a result of working with a teacher trainer. Of those who responded negatively, the most frequently cited reason was the "lack of availability" of the teacher trainer (due to multiple school assignments).

Two of every three trainees also believed that they were better able to deal with the different aspects of teaching in a poverty area as a result of working with a teacher trainer.

The STINT trainees' contact with the STINT teacher trainer was reported to be frequent. Seventy percent reported receiving assistance once a week or more often, and 73 percent found this assistance to be at least "frequently" helpful and constructive.

The techniques most often utilized (74 to 86 percent) by the STINT trainers were individual conferences, grade conferences with supervisors, follow-up conferences after demonstration lessons, individual and group planning, and the use of instructional equipment. These techniques were considered to be "very successful" or "quite successful" by at least 53 percent of the trainees, with the exception of grade conferences with supervisors (23 percent rated similarly).

In comparison to the non-STINT beginning teachers, a greater proportion of STINT trainees received continuous and effective support in all areas of curriculum, methodology and class control.

As might be expected, the morale of the trainees was reported by half the trainees as being "much" or "somewhat" better than that of other beginning teachers who had not received assistance from the STINT teacher trainer. Of the remaining half, all but 3 percent of the respondents indicated that the morale was "about the same" in both cases. Once again, recalling the initially inferred differences in preparation and class assignments of these two groups, these are positive data.

It was not surprising then to find that 71 percent of the trainees felt that the overall effectiveness of the program was either "excellent" (28 percent), "very good" (25 percent) or "good" (18 percent). The 7 percent each who rated it "poor" or "unsatisfactory" indicated they did so because they felt the program was not functioning well enough to satisfy their needs, rather than a denial of the value or need for a program of assistance to new teachers.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the criteria used to evaluate this initial year of the STINT program, and these initial analyses of our data,[1] the program was successful.

The positive evaluation to date of both the program and the trainers selected to implement it was consistent across the roles of the district coordinator, the principal and the trainees themselves. The teacher trainers too shared in the overall positive appraisal of the program and the value derived from it. The professional educators who visited the classes taught by the trainees were impressed by their level of professional functioning, and consistently rated them higher than beginning teachers graduated from intensive and regular programs of teacher preparation.

These findings lead to the recommendation that the program be continued, and that it be expanded to the extent that comparably competent trainers can be recruited.

Organizational recommendations which follow include: the need for a director of the program charged with the responsibility for supervising the recruitment and sèlection of trainers; the selection of both control and program sites; orientation of trainers; the selection and development of materials; and the need to clarify the role models of trainer, district coordinator, and assistant principal in a school with a teacher trainer on staff.

As to the trainers, the criteria of extensive and varied experience seem to have worked well. Some of the data suggest a trainer should have responsibility for no more than one school and that the merits of limiting the number of different grade levels involved should also be considered. This is particularly true in view of the previous studies which have highlighted children's difficulties at grades three and four. Clearly, the trainer's functioning would be expedited by better physical facilities, at least a room to call her own.

The implication in this positive set of data is that the STINT program offers a promising approach to teacher preparation. Further evaluation on a year-round basis is necessary. If substantiated, undoubtedly this approach would be generalized beyond New York City.

---

[1] The reader is reminded that time pressure dictated that the evaluation be presented in two parts. Part II will be published in January 1970 and will contain the indepth analysis of the data.

We therefore remind the reader of our inability to design and implement the pre-post matched group design (including control schools and teachers) needed to definitively evaluate the program and strongly recommend that this be done in 1969-1970. The importance of such evaluation lies in the suggestion in these initial data that a strengthened STINT program has great potential for making a difference in the functioning of new and inexperienced teachers and thereby helping improve the educational opportunities of the children in their classes.

APPENDIX A

TABLE		PAGE
A1	Proportion of Average and Below Average Ratings, Teacher Functioning, ILOR-II, by Sample	A1
A2	Proportion of Average and Below Average Ratings, Teacher-Pupil Interaction, ILOR-II, by Sample	A3
A3	Proportion of Average and Below Average Ratings, Teacher Characteristics, ILOR-II, by Sample	A5
A4	Techniques of Teacher Training Utilized and Evaluated by Teacher Trainers, in Percent	A6

TABLE A1

PROPORTION OF AVERAGE AND BELOW AVERAGE RATINGS
TEACHER FUNCTIONING, ILOR-II, BY SAMPLE

N = STINT Trainees 113, Non-STINT Beginning Teachers in STINT Schools 25, Comparative Data on
Beginning Substitutes 95, Beginning Regular Teachers 43,
Beginning and Experienced Teachers 91

	Average					Below Average				
	STINT Schools		Comparative Data			STINT Schools		Comparative Data		
Aspect	STINT Trnees	Non-STINT Beg Tchrs	Beg Sub Teachers	Beg Reg Teachers	Reg & Exp Teachers	STINT Trnees	Non-STINT Beg Tchrs	Beg Sub Teachers	Beg Reg Teachers	Reg & Exp Teachers
Extent children physically active and involved with what they were doing	69	50	54*	48*	**	9	9	27*	28	**
Teacher's understanding of and familiarity with material	67	55	70	62	**	7	5	7	9	**
Extent lesson referred to earlier material	57	65	46	42	52	20	13	42*	35*	36*
Extent lesson laid foundation for independent work	56	59	44	38*	50	26	14	38*	45*	33
Extent lesson laid foundation for future lesson	51	41*	63	57	42	8	4	18*	24*	17*
Amount of material covered	46	52	61*	50	49	15	15	10	31*	25

TABLE A1 (continued)

PROPORTION OF AVERAGE AND BELOW AVERAGE RATINGS TEACHER FUNCTIONING, ILOR-II, BY SAMPLE (continued)

	Average					Below Average				
	STINT Schools		Comparative Data			STINT Schools		Comparative Data		
Aspect	STINT Trnees	Non-STINT Beg Tchrs	Beg Sub Teachers	Beg Reg Teachers	Reg & Exp Teachers	STINT Trnees	Non-STINT Beg Tchrs	Beg Sub Teachers	Beg Reg Teachers	Reg & Exp Teachers
Depth of instruction	37	36	38	36	42	24	23	29	40*	26
Overall quality of instruction	35	35	38	25	33	19	17	26	33*	25
Use of children's background and experience	35	58*	25	19	46	39	21	59*	65*	26*
Level of creativity and imagination evidenced	29	26	21	14*	26	56	65	65	72*	62
Planning and orga[illegible]	24	17	32	16	66*	11	13	23*	28*	22*
Teach[illegible]s style of questioning	23	32	14	5*	**	62	54	72	88*	**
Extent and how effectively teaching aids used	23	32	15	21	20	68	59	81*	77	78

*Significant at .05 level--comparison made between STINT trainees and group designated in the direction of the STINT trainees.

**Comparison data was not available for these aspects.

TABLE A2

PROPORTION OF AVERAGE AND BELOW AVERAGE RATINGS TEACHER-PUPIL INTERACTION, ILOR-II, BY SAMPLE

N = STINT Trainees 113, Non-STINT Beginning Teachers in STINT Schools 23, Comparative Data on Beginning Substitutes 95, Beginning Regular Teachers 43, Beginning and Experienced Teachers 91

	Average					Below Average				
	STINT Schools		Comparative Data			STINT Schools		Comparative Data		
Aspect	STINT Trnees	Non-STINT Beg Tchrs	Beg Sub Teachers	Beg Reg Teachers	Reg & Exp Teachers	STINT Trnees	Non-STINT Beg Tchrs	Beg Sub Teachers	Beg Reg Teachers	Reg & Exp Teachers
Teacher's overall handling of the children's questions	36	19	30	16*	27	32	44	26	37	40
Children's volunteering in response to teacher questions	18	32	17	18	24	29	18	47*	41	36
Children's interest and enthusiasm	15	13	20	5*	13	18	13	33*	49*	36
Teacher's verbal communication with non-English speaking children	15	10	14	17	**	2	10	5	14*	**
Overall teacher-pupil relationship	9	4	20*	14	**	5	4	7	21*	**
Overal participation of children	9	00*	21*	14	15	13	22	18	19	19

TABLE A2 (continued)

PROPORTION OF AVERAGE AND BELOW AVERAGE RATINGS
TEACHER-PUPIL INTERACTION, IIOR-II, BY SAMPLE (continued)

	Average					Below Average				
	STINT Schools		Comparative Data			STINT Schools		Comparative Data		
Aspect	STINT Trnees	Non-STINT Beg Tchrs	Beg Sub Teachers	Beg Reg Teachers	Reg & Exp Teachers	STINT Trnees	Non-STINT Beg Tchrs	Beg Sub Teachers	Beg Reg Teachers	Reg & Exp Teachers
Overall relationship among the children	7	4	17*	16	17*	4	9	4	7	3
Classroom atmosphere in terms of discipline and in terms of warmth	4	4	14*	14*	**	28	4*	27	44*	**
Teacher's verbal communication with children	3	00	8	5	10*	3	00	3	7	2
Children raising questions	2	9	21*	18*	3	96	91	75*	80*	97

*Significant at .05 level--comparison made between STINT trainees and group designated in the direction of the STINT trainees.

**Comparison data were not available for these aspects.

TABLE A3

PROPORTION OF AVERAGE AND BELOW AVERAGE RATINGS
TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS, ILOR:II, BY SAMPLE

N = STINT Trainees 113, Non-STINT Beginning Teachers in STINT School 23, Comparative Data on Beginning Substitutes 95, Beginning Regular Teachers 43

	Average				Below Average			
	STINT Schools		Control Schools--ITTP		STINT Schools		Control Schools--ITTP	
Aspect	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beg. Tchrs.	Beginning Sub. Tchrs.	Beginning Reg. Tchrs.	STINT Trainees	Non-STINT Beg. Tchrs.	Beginning Sub. Tchrs.	Beginning Reg. Tchrs.
Impression teacher gave you and children about children's maximum level of performance	59	53	58	44	17	10	27	23
Teacher's maturity	45	48	55	56	09	00*	17	14
Teacher's self-confidence	37	52	46	31	12	04	16	17

*Significant at .05 level--comparison made between STINT trainees and group designated in the direction of the STINT trainees.

TABLE A4

TECHNIQUES OF TEACHER TRAINING UTILIZED AND EVALUATED BY TEACHER TRAINERS, IN PERCENT

Technique	Part I--Utilization					Part II--Effectiveness			
	2-8 Times per Month	About 4 Times/Month	Less Than Bi-Monthly	Did Not Use	Total N	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Total N
Demonstration Lessons									
With the trainee's class	84	12	3	1	191	87	11	2	190
Pre-planning with trainee	85	11	3	1	183	83	16	1	182
Follow-up conference	83	13	4	0	187	89	10	1	187
Inter-Visitation									
To experienced teachers	35	18	26	21	198	69	21	10	140
To other trainees	16	17	23	44	168	76	18	6	98
Observation of Other Teachers									
Pre-planning before observation	28	15	26	31	167	84	13	3	103
Follow-up conference with observed teacher	31	12	24	33	166	72	22	6	116
Follow-up conference without observed teacher	19	15	24	42	153	77	18	5	91
Video taped observations	4	1	2	93	155	58	4	38	26
Conference									
Individual	96	2	1	1	193	96	4	0	185
Group	48	24	21	7	153	82	16	2	167
Discuss common lesson observation with group of trainees	34	17	24	25	163	76	17	7	121
Workshops									
Develop instructional materials and techniques	47	17	21	15	169	78	19	3	145
Plan and plan book organization	39	22	26	13	174	74	21	6	143
Room and display materials	36	20	22	22	166	77	19	4	132
Curriculum study	45	22	19	14	168	73	22	5	143
Methods and procedures	59	13	15	13	165	80	19	1	142

TABLE A4 (continued)

TECHNIQUES OF TEACHER TRAINING UTILIZED AND EVALUATED BY TEACHER TRAINERS, IN PERCENT (continued)

	Part I--Utilization					Part II--Effectiveness			
Technique	2-8 Times per Month	About 4 Times/Month	Less Than Bi-Monthly	Did Not Use	Total N	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Total N
Grade Conferences									
Curriculum material	22	33	22	23	172	66	27	7	132
With supervisors	27	34	17	22	172	65	28	7	139
Goals and expectations	23	27	24	26	156	60	30	10	115
Curriculum Area Study									
Curriculum coordinators	11	24	37	28	162	58	28	14	120
Consultants and specialists	10	15	45	30	158	59	28	13	111
Materials for the curriculum area	36	25	30	9	166	69	25	6	144
Micro-Teaching									
Methods and materials	60	13	11	16	143	78	21	1	118
Skills and techniques	61	15	10	14	144	82	17	1	121
Whole class	62	16	10	22	141	80	18	2	119
Small group	51	19	12	18	137	80	15	5	106
Planning									
Individual	88	10	2	0	178	88	12	0	177
Cooperative in pairs and by group	42	16	17	25	165	77	16	7	129
Planning for individual children	62	21	13	4	169	79	19	2	160
Use of Instructional Equipment (audiovisual, flannel boards, realia, etc.)	66	15	17	2	225	87	11	2	245
Use of films and tapes of lessons for analysis and discussion	12	12	17	59	159	74	16	10	68
Conferences in self-evaluation by trainees	34	25	32	9	162	72	27	1	151

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

	Page
Interview Guide for District Coordinators	B1
Questionnaire for Teacher Trainer	B6
Interview Guide for Teacher Trainer	B12
Interview Guide for the School Principal	B17
Teacher Questionnaire Form A	B23
Teacher Questionnaire Form B	B32
Guidelines for the Teacher Trainer	B41

Center for Urban Education

Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR DISTRICT COORDINATORS

As you may know, we are evaluating the "Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers" (STINT). We would like to ask you a few questions relating to this program. Only the project director and her immediate staff will see any record of this questionnaire. Neither you, the teacher-trainers, or your district will ever be identified in any way with our reports.

Name ______________________ Date ______________

District ______________________ Borough ______________

1. Your position in STINT ______________________

2. Lincense(s): (Please circle)

   1. **Early** Childhood ________
   2. Common Branches ________
   3. J.H.S. Subject ________
   4. H.S. Subject ________
   5. Other (specify) ________

3. Total years of teaching experience

   Special Service Schools ____________
   Non-special Service Schools ____________

4. Other experiences in educational systems

5. Positions held immediately prior to present position

6. Did you receive specialized preparations in area assigned to this program?

   Yes No

   If yes, specify the type of training you received?

7. When were you first informed about your appointment in this program?

8. What proportion of your present schedule is assigned as STINT district coordinator?

   1. All
   2. More than half
   3. Half
   4. Less than half

   If not "All," what other duties and responsibilities do you have as part of your present assignment?

9. What is the full title of your present position?

10. What materials and facilities are available to you as STINT district coordinator?

11. How many STINT teacher-trainers have been assigned to this district since November __________? since February ______________?

12. Are all of these positions filled?

    Yes No

13. Has the district added any teacher-trainers independent of STINT?

    Yes No

14. If yes, how many were added? __________
    From what funds are these additions paid? ______________

15. How, and by whom were the STINT teacher-trainers selected?

16. How many, if any STINT teacher-trainers were dropped from the program? ____

    Why?

17. How many schools are in this district?

Special-Service Schools __________

Non-Special Service Schools _______

18. How many of these schools have STINT teacher-trainers?

SS Schools _____________

NSS Schools ____________

19. How many STINT teacher-trainers are placed in schools in which they were teaching?__________
How many teacher-trainers not in same school are from this district? _______

20. How many STINT Teacher-trainers are assigned to one school _______________, two schools _______________, three schools ____________________.

If some STINT teacher-trainers assigned to more than one school, what was the criteria for the multiple placements?

21. To your knowledge, how involved are the principals in this district with the supervision of STINT teachers?

1. More supervision and assistance than before.
2. The same supervision and assistance as before.
3. Less supervision and assistance than before.
4. I have no basis for making this judgment.

22. How many STINT coordinator conferences have you attended?

What suggestions do you have for future coordinator meetings?

23. Do you conduct activities for STINT teacher-trainers?

Yes No

If yes, please indicate activities where appropriate:

	Number	Topics, etc.
1. Conferences		
2. Workshops (for District only)		
3. Cooperative Workshops (with other District(s)		
4. Special events		
5. Other		

24. Do you visit teacher-trainers in their schools on a standard schedule?

Yes No

If yes, how often? ______________

If no, what are the determining factors? ______________________

25. In a sentence, or two, please describe your function in the program?

26. What kinds of records do you keep of your activities in the program?

27. What kinds of records do you keep of visits to STINT teacher-trainers?

28. What kinds of records do you keep of evaluations of STINT teacher-trainers?

29. Of the ________STINT teacher-trainers in your district, how many would you rate in each of the following categories:

____Excellent
____Very Good
____Good
____Fair
____Poor
____Unsatisfactory

30. What distinguishes the ones you have rated excellent from those rated very good and good?

31. Of the ________STINT teacher-trainers in your district, how many would you request as teacher-trainer next year?__________

32. How would you rate the effectiveness of the STINT program in this district?

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor
6. Unsatisfactory

33. How would you rate the morale of the trainees as compared with beginning teachers of prior years?

1. Much better morale than in previous years
2. Somewhat better morale than in previous years
3. About the same morale as in previous years
4. Somewhat worse morale than in previous years
5. Much worse morale than in previous years

34. Please rate your impressions of the attitudes towards STINT for each of the following groups by circling the appropriate number?

1. means very favorable
2. means moderately favorable
3. means neutral
4. means moderately negative
5. means very negative
6. no basis for making a judgment

1. District Superintendent	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Curriculum Coordinators	1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Principals	1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Assistants to Principal	1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Teacher Trainers	1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Trainees	1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Other teachers in school	1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Other school personnel (i.e., guidance counselors, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Parents	1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Community organizations	1 2 3 4 5 6

35. In your opinion, what are the specific strengths of this program?

36. In your opinion, what are the specific weaknesses of this program?

37. What recommendations would you suggest to improve this program?

Center for Urban Education

Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHER TRAINER

As you may know, we are evaluating the "Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers" (STINT). We would like you to answer a few questions regarding this program. Only the project director and her immediate staff will see any record of this questionnaire. Neither you, your trainees, nor the school or district will ever be identified, unless you wish to be listed as a participant in the program.

Name______________________________ Date______________

School______________ District______________ Borough______________

1. How much, if any, supervision and/or assistance do your trainees receive from the following school personnel:

Supervised and/or Assisted (check)

Personnel	Once a week or more	Once or twice a month	Once or twice since school began	None	Do Not Know
Principal					
Assistant-to-Principal					
Guidance Counselor					
Other Teaching Personnel (O.T.P.)					
STINT District Coordinator					
District Curriculum Specialists					
Others ______					

2. How much supervision and/or assistance is given to the other new teachers with whom you have not worked consistently as a STINT trainee?

Supervised and/or Assisted (check)

Personnel	Once a week or more	Once or twice a month	Once or twice since school began	None	Do Not Know
Principal					
Assistant-to-Principal					
Guidance Counselor					
Other Teaching Personnel (O.T.P.)					
District Curriculum Specialists					
Others ______ ______					

3. Of the ________ (number) STINT trainees in the school, how many would you rate in each of the following categories?

_____Excellent Teacher
_____Very Good Teacher
_____Good Teacher
_____Fair Teacher
_____Poor Teacher
_____Unsatisfactory Teacher
_____Do Not Know

4. What distinguishes the ones you have rated excellent from those rated very good and good?

5. What distinguishes the ones you have rated poor from those rated unsatisfactory?

6. Of ten typical beginning teachers (not in STINT) how many would you rate in each of the following categories?

_____Excellent
_____Very Good
_____Good
_____Fair
_____Poor
_____Unsatisfactory
_____Do Not Know

7. If you had the responsibility of hiring teachers, (a) of the _____STINT trainees in your school, how many would you request as teachers next year?_____ (b) of the _____ non-STINT beginning teachers, how many would you request?_____

8. How would you rate the effectiveness of the STINT program in the school(s) in which you have worked?

_____Excellent
_____Very Good
_____Good
_____Fair
_____Poor
_____Unsatisfactory

9. Please indicate the extent of supervision and/or assistance given to you by each of the persons listed below. Where some supervision and/or assistance occurred would you please rate how helpful it was to you with respect to your effectiveness as a teacher trainer, using the following scale:

1. means always provided constructive suggestions
2. means frequently provided constructive suggestions
3. means sometimes provided constructive suggestions
4. means was more critical than constructive
5. means was always critical and never constructive

Extent of Supervision and/or Assistance (check)					Rating of Supervision and/or Assistance (circle choice)				
None	Once or twice since school began	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more	Personnel					
				STINT Personnel Director or Assistant (Board of Education)	1	2	3	4	5
				District Curriculum Coordinators	1	2	3	4	5
				STINT District Coordinator	1	2	3	4	5
				Principal	1	2	3	4	5
				Assistant-to-Principal	1	2	3	4	5
				Experienced Teachers in the School	1	2	3	4	5
				Trainees	1	2	3	4	5
				Others _______	1	2	3	4	5

10. Listed below are some areas of concern to beginning teachers. Several of these aspects may be of greater concern at different times during the course of the term. We are therefore asking you to consider each aspect at two different periods of time. "Period A" refers to the beginning of the term (November and December); "Period B" refers to the latter half of the term to date (March to May).

For each aspect listed please indicate how serious a problem it presented to your trainees during each time period, according to the following scale:

1. means a serious and frequent problem, happened about once a week
2. means a serious problem, but happened only two to three times during period
3. means a serious problem, but happened only once
4. means a moderate problem which happened once a week
5. means a moderate problem which happened two to three times during period
6. means no problem occurred with this aspect

Then please appraise how effective you think your assistance was in helping the trainees with each aspect during each time period according to the following scale:

1. means all necessary help effectively provided
2. means all help provided was effective but I did not have time to provide all help necessary
3. means most help provided was effective, some was ineffective
4. means help provided was equally effective and ineffective (about half and half)
5. means most help provided was ineffective, some was effective
6. means the help provided was generally ineffective
7. means there was generally no opportunity to help with this aspect since I lacked the specific skill(s) or knowledge

ASPECT	Period A		Period B	
	Seriousness of Problem	Effectiveness of Help	Seriousness of Problem	Effectiveness of Help
1. General methods of teaching				
2. Methods of teaching reading				
3. Methods of teaching math				
4. Planning lessons--daily, weekly, unit, term				
5. Development of instructional materials				
6. Use of instructional materials				
7. New educational media, i.e. programed instruction				
8. Evaluation of learning, test, grades, etc.				
9. Expectations of pupil achievement				
10. Motivating a class				
11. Questioning techniques				
12. Understanding children's behavior				
13. Discipline in the classroom				
14. Routines of class and classroom management				
15. Clerical tasks, i.e. Roll Books				
16. Providing for individual differences				
17. Providing for the exceptional child				
18. Group activities--large and small				
19. Special services in the school, i.e. guidance				
20. Pupil-teacher relationships				
21. Parent-teacher relationships				
22. Teacher-paraprofessional relationships				
23. Teacher-co-worker relationships				
24. Teacher-principal relationships				
25. Teacher (trainee)-teacher-trainer relationships				
26. School-community relations				
27. Professional relations, i.e. organizations				
28. Self-evaluation (strengths and				

11. Listed below are some techniques advocated for teacher training. In Part 1, please indicate to what extent you utilized each approach by writing the appropriate number as follows:

1. means about once or more a week
2. means about twice a month
3. means about once a month
4. means about once every two months
5. means about once every three months
6. means not at all

In Part II please estimate how successful you found each of these techniques as follows:

1. means very successful
2. means quite successful
3. means moderately successful
4. means slightly successful
5. means not successful

Technique	Part I Utilization	Part II Effectiveness
1. Demonstration lessons		
a) with the trainee's class		
b) pre-planning with trainee		
c) follow-up conference		
2. Inter-visitation		
a) to experienced teachers		
b) to other trainees		
3. Observation of other teachers		
a) pre-planning before observation		
b) follow-up conference with observed teacher		
c) follow-up conference without observed teacher		
d) Video-taped observations		
4. Conferences		
a) individual		
b) group		
c) discuss common lesson observation with group trainees		
5. Workshops		
a) develop instructional materials and techniques		
b) plan and plan book organization		
c) room and display materials		
d) curriculum study		
e) method and procedure		
6. Grade Conferences		
a) curriculum material		
b) with supervisors		
c) goals and expectations		
7. Curriculum area study		
a) curriculum coordinators		
b) consultants and specialists		
c) materials for the curriculum area		
8. Micro-teaching		
a) methods and materials		
b) skills and techniques		
c) whole class		
d) small group		
9. Planning		
a) individual		
b) cooperative in pairs and by group		
c) planning for individual children		
10. Use of instructional equipment (audio-visual, flannel boards, realia, etc.)		
11. Use of films and tapes of lessons for analysis and discussion		
12. Conferences in self-evaluation by trainees		
13. Other		

12. How would you rate the morale of the trainees as compared with other beginning teachers with whom you have contact? (Circle the appropriate number.)

    1. Much better morale than other beginning teachers
    2. Somewhat better morale than other beginning teachers
    3. About the same morale as other beginning teachers
    4. Somewhat worse morale than other beginning teachers
    5. Much worse morale than other beginning teachers

13. In general, do you think the overall school morale has been affected by the presence of a STINT teacher trainer? (circle all that apply)

    1. Yes
        a) Positively
        b) Negatively
    2. No
    3. Can't tell

14. Please rate your impressions of the attitudes towards STINT for each of the following groups by circling the appropriate number.

    1. means very favorable
    2. means moderately favorable
    3. means neutral
    4. means moderately negative
    5. means very negative
    6. no basis for making a judgment

1.	District Superintendent	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	District Curriculum Coordinators	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	STINT District Coordinator	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	Principals	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	Assistants to Principal	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	Trainees	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	Other beginning teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	Other teachers in school	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	Other school professional personnel, i.e. guidance counselors	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	Non-professional school personnel, i.e. education assistants	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	Parents	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	Community organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please retain and return to Interviewer.

Thank you very much.

Center for Urban Education

Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR TEACHER TRAINER

As you may know, we are evaluating the "Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers" (STINT). We would like to ask you a few questions relating to this program. Only the project director and her immediate staff will see any record of this interview. Neither you, nor your trainees, the school or district will ever be identified in our reports, unless you wish to be listed as a participant in the program.

NAME____DATE________________

SCHOOL__________________DISTRICT________________BOROUGH____________

1. Which of the following licenses do you hold? (Circle all that apply)
    1. Early Childhood
    2. Common Branches
    3. Junior High School (Subject)___________
    4. High School (Subject)___________
    5. Other (specify)___________

2. Total years of teaching experience

    Special Service Schools___________
    Non-Special Service Schools___________

3. Other experience in educational system

4. Position held immediately prior to present position

5. Did you receive specialized preparation in teacher training or supervision? Yes No

6. If yes, what type of training did you have (circle all that apply), and for how long a period of time?
    1. College training in supervising student teachers______
    2. College training in administration and/or supervision______
    3. On-the-job experience as a student teacher coordinator______
    4. On-the-job experience as a cooperating teacher______
    5. On-the-job experience as an acting principal of assistant to principal______
    6. Other____________________________

7. When did you first hear about STINT?

8. Why did you want to participate in the program?

9. When were you first informed about your appointment in this program?

10. What proportion of your present schedule is assigned as a STINT teacher trainer?

1. All	3. Half
2. More than half	4. Less than half

11. If not "all", what other duties and responsibilities do you have as part of your present assignment?

12. What materials have been especially provided for you as a STINT teacher trainer?

13. What materials, if any, do you need that you don't presently have to have your program function at maximum effectiveness?

14. What physical (room, etc.) facilities have been especially provided for you as a STINT teacher-trainer?

15. What, if any, additional facilities do you think are necessary for your training program to function at maximum effectiveness?

16. Was there any conflict of interests that interfered with your functioning? (Please be frank, these reports are confidential.)

17. How, and by whom, were the trainees selected?

18. How many regular (had own class) new teachers did you work with intensively?________

19. Were all the trainees beginning (first year of teaching) teachers?
Yes No

20. If no, how were they selected to receive your assistance and how much prior experience did they have?

21. Were you called upon by teachers other than your trainees for assistance?
Yes No

22. If yes, how often and under what circumstances?

23. Did you discontinue working with any trainees?
Yes No

24. If yes, how many, after how long a period of time, and why?

25. What kinds of records do you keep of your activities in the program?

26. Do you visit trainees in their classrooms on a standard schedule?

Yes No

27. If yes, how often?________

28. If no, what are the factors determining when you visit?

29. Do you engage in any activities of services as part of STINT that you have not had an opportunity to report, in either the questionnaire or this interview?

Yes No

30. If yes, or if you wish to elaborate on an activity, etc. that you feel warrants more attention, please do so now.

31. Think back to your last complete work week; please estimate as closely as possible how many hours of your time you spent in each of the following activities:

______a. Direct work with teachers in their classroom

______b. Conferences with individual teachers

______c. Conferences with groups of teachers

______d. Workshops for trainees

______e. Working with individual children

______f. Working with groups of children

______g. Conferences with parents

______h. Conferences with district personnel

______i. Attending district teacher-trainer conferences

______j. Attending district teacher-trainer workshops

______k. Attending conferences and/or workshops for all STINT personnel

32. Put down the letter of the activity listed above you find to be personally most rewarding______

33. Put down the letter of the activity listed above you find to be personally least rewarding______

34. Would you like to continue in the STINT program as a teacher trainer?
Yes No

35. If yes, why?

36. In your opinion, what are the specific strengths of the STINT program?

37. In your opinion, what are the specific weaknesses of the STINT program?

38. What recommendations would you suggest to improve the STINT program for next year?

39. Do you have any suggestions regarding evaluation of the program for this year, or for next year?

40. Would you like to be a STINT teacher trainer in this school again next year?
Yes No

41. If no, why not?

42. What is the criteria for selecting trainees?

May I please have your completed Teacher Trainer Questionnaire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Interviewed by____

Center for Urban Education

Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

As you may know, we are evaluating the "Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers" (STINT). We would like to ask you a few questions relating to this program. Only the project director and her immediate staff will see any record of this questionnaire. Neither you, the teacher trainers, nor your school will ever be identified unless you want your school listed as a participant in the program.

School ____________ District ___________ Borough _____________

Grades: From _______ to _______

Principal's name ___________________________ Date ____________

1. How long have you been principal at this school? _______________

2. What is the present school population? _______________

3. How are the classes grouped?

   Homogeneously ________

   Heterogeneously _________

   By what criterion? _________

4. What is the meaning of the class exponent, i.e., the brightest class on each grade has the exponent #1, the next brightest #2, etc.

5. How many inexperienced new teachers were assigned to this school in September? _______________

6. How many of that original group are still teaching in this school? ________

7. How does this compare to attribution among beginning teachers by this time last year?

   Higher Same Lower

8. Has a STINT teacher trainer been assigned to your school?

   Yes No

9. Was the STINT teacher trainer on your faculty prior to this program?

Yes No

10. If YES, in what capacity?

11. With how many trainees does the STINT teacher trainer work? ______

12. How many of the trainees have dropped out to date? __________

13. If any, what were the circumstances?

14. Of the beginning teachers who remained, how many were STINT trainees? ______

15. Of the beginning teachers who remained, how many were NOT STINT trainees? _

16. To what extent has the STINT teacher trainer provided supportive services in the following areas? Please rate each area using this scale:

1. means provided continuous effective support to trainees
2. means provided continuous but ineffective support to trainees
3. means provided sporadic but effective support to trainees
4. means provided sporadic and ineffective support to trainees
5. means provided no support to trainees
6. means do not know

a) Curriculum (General) ______
 Reading ______
 Math ______
 Social Studies ______
 Science ______
 Other ______

b) Methodology (General) ______
 Reading ______
 Math ______
 Social Studies ______
 Science ______

c) Class control (General) ______
 Room Management ______
 Discipline ______

17. To your knowledge, are the STINT trainees given on-the-job immediate help when and where it is needed by the teacher-trainer?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Sometimes
4. Do not know

18. In your opinion, how do STINT trainees compare in sensitivity and awareness of the emotional and learning needs of the children in her (or his) class, to non-STINT beginning teachers?

    1. Trainees are acutely more sensitive and aware than other beginning teachers.
    2. Trainees are more sensitive and aware than other beginning teachers.
    3. Trainees are about as sensitive and aware as other beginning teachers.
    4. Trainees seem somewhat less sensitive and aware than other beginning teachers.
    5. Trainees seem much less sensitive and aware than other beginning teachers.
    6. Do not know.

19. If you answered 1 or 2 to the above question, to what extent do you attribute this to the STINT training?

    Completely Partially Not at all

20. Please indicate the frequency of supervision you or the Assistant-to-Principal exercise over the following school staff:

	Extent Of Supervision				
Personnel	Once a week or more	Once or twice a month	Once or twice since began	As Needed	None
STINT teacher trainer					
STINT trainees					
Other beginning teachers					
Experienced teachers					

21. Of the _____ STINT trainees in the school, how many would you rate in the (number) following categories?

    _____excellent teacher
    _____very good teacher
    _____good teacher
    _____fair teacher
    _____poor teacher
    _____unsatisfactory teacher

22. What distinguishes the ones you have rated excellent from those rated very good and good?

23. What distinguishes the ones you have rated poor from those rated very poor?

24. Of ten typical beginning teachers (not in STINT) how many would you rate in each of the following categories?

_____excellent
_____very good
_____good
_____fair
_____poor
_____unsatisfactory
_____do not know

25. How would you rate the morale of the STINT trainees as compared with that of other beginning teachers who are not receiving assistance from the STINT teacher-trainer?

1. Much better morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
2. Somewhat better morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
3. About the same morale as non-STINT beginning teachers
4. Somewhat worse morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
5. Much worse morale than non-STINT beginning teachers

26. How would you rate the overall school morale this year as compared to that of last year?

1. Much better morale than in previous years
2. Somewhat better morale than in previous years
3. About the same morale as in previous years
4. Somewhat worse morale than in previous years
5. Much worse morale than in previous years

27. Do you think the presence of the STINT teacher-trainer has influenced this change to any degree?

a) Totally
b) Considerably
c) Partially
d) Not at all

28. How would you rate the teacher-trainer assigned to this school in the following areas using this scale:

1. means poor
2. means fair
3. means good
4. means superior
5. means excellent

1. Interpersonal relationships

a) _____with supervisors
b) _____with trainees
c) _____with other teachers
d) _____with parents
e) _____with children
f) _____with auxiliary personnel

2. Teaching ability

a) _____classroom teaching
b) _____classroom demonstration lessons
c) _____teacher training workshops

3. Personal attributes

a) _____energy
b) _____alertness
c) _____adaptability
d) _____professional attitude
e) _____appearance

4. Overall effectiveness _______

29. Please rate your impressions of the attitudes towards STINT for each of the following groups by circling the appropriate number?

1. means very favorable
2. means moderately favorable
3. means neutral
4. means moderately negative
5. means very negative
6. no basis for making a judgment

1. District Superintendent	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Curriculum Coordinators	1 2 3 4 5 6
3. STINT District Coordinators	1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Assistants to Principal	1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Teacher Trainers	1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Trainees	1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Other teachers in school	1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Other school personnel (i.e. guidance counselors, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Parents	1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Community organizations	1 2 3 4 5 6

30. What do you consider to be the major strengths of the STINT teacher-trainer?

31. What do you consider to be the major weaknesses of the STINT teacher-trainer?

32. What recommendations would you suggest to improve this program?

33. Overall, how would you rate the effectiveness of the STINT program in this school?

_____Excellent
_____Very Good
_____Good
_____Fair
_____Poor
_____Unsatisfactory

34. Do you have any suggestions regarding evaluating this program?

35. Would you request the same STINT teacher-trainer for next year?

_____Yes _____No

36. Why?

37. Do you consider the STINT trainees to be better able to deal with the learning and emotional problems that arise in a ghetto class--room than non-STINT trainees?

_____Yes _____No _____Do not know

38. If yes, please explain.

39. To what extent do you think the presence of the STINT teacher-trainer has influenced this change?

_____1) Totally
_____2) Considerably
_____Partially
_____Not At All

Center for Urban Education

Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE FORM A

GRADE________

District #________ School #________ Borough ________

We would like to reassure you that this questionnaire is strictly confidential and will be seen only by the project director and her immediate staff. Neither you, nor your school and district, will ever be identified in any of our reports.

1. Are you presently, or have you at some time during this school year worked with a STINT teacher trainer?

   a. Yes b. No

2. Which of the following licenses do you hold? (Circle all that apply)

   1. Early Childhood
   2. Common Branches
   3. Substitute
   4. Conditional Substitute
   5. Emergency Substitute
   6. Other ________________

3. What type of teacher preparation did you have?

   1. Regular undergraduate teacher education program
   2. Regular graduate teacher education program
   3. Intensive (short-term) graduate teacher education program
   4. Professional courses necessary to qualify for substitute license (not a formal program)
   5. Other ________________

4. Is this your first teaching assignment?

   a. Yes b. No

5. If NO, what other teaching experience have you had and for how long?

6. Please indicate the extent of supervision and/or assistance given to you by each of the persons listed below. Where some supervision and/or assistance occurred would you please indicate how helpful it was to you with respect to your effectiveness as a teacher, using the following scale:

1. means always provided constructive suggestions
2. means frequently provided constructive suggestions
3. means sometimes provided constructive suggestions
4. means commented on observed lesson
5. means no comments offered
8. I prefer not to respond
9. means does not apply

Extent of Supervision and/or Assistance (check)				Personnel	Quality of Supervision and/or Assistance (circle choice)
None	Once or twice since school began	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more		
				STINT Teacher Trainer	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				Grade Leader	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				"Buddy" Teacher	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				Guidance Counselor	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				O. T. P. i.e., Corrective Reading Tchr.	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				Experienced Teachers in School	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				Other ________	1 2 3 4 5 8 9

7. To what extent has supportive service (assistance, etc.) been provided this past school year in the following areas? Please indicate the title of the person providing the most support in each area and indicate the nature of this service by circling the appropriate number as follows:

1. means provided continuous effective support
2. means provided continuous but ineffective support
3. means provided sporadic but effective support
4. means provided sporadic and ineffective support
5. means no support provided but would have been helpful
6. means no support provided and none needed

	Personnel	Rating				
a. Curriculum (General)						
Reading		1	2	3	4	5
Math		1	2	3	4	5
Social Studies		1	2	3	4	5
Science		1	2	3	4	5
Other		1	2	3	4	5
b. Methodology (General)						
Reading		1	2	3	4	5
Math		1	2	3	4	5
Social Studies		1	2	3	4	5
Science		1	2	3	4	5
c. Class Control (General)						
Room Management		1	2	3	4	5
Discipline		1	2	3	4	5

8. To what extent were you given on-the-job immediate help when and where it was needed by a member of the school staff?

a. Always
b. Usually
c. Sometimes
d. Never

9. If you received such assistance, what was the title of the person who provided the major portion of this help?

____

10. Listed below are some areas of concern to teachers. In Column 1 please estimate your current competency in each aspect as follows:

1. means "Excellent"	4. means "Poor"
2. means "Good"	5. means "Totally Unsatisfactory"
3. means "Fair"	9. means "Does Not Apply"

If you were a STINT trainee, in Column 2 please indicate the extent you attribute your current competence in this area to the teacher trainer as follows:

1. means "Completely"	4. means "Slightly"
2. means "Considerably"	5. means "Not At All"
3. means "Moderately"	9. means "Does Not Apply"

ASPECT	Column 1 Self Appraisal	Column 2 Influence of Trainer
1. General methods of teaching	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
2. Methods of teaching reading	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
3. Planning lessons--daily, weekly, unit, term	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
4. Use of instructional materials	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
5. Evaluation of learning, test, grades, etc.	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
6. Motivating a class	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
7. Understanding children's behavior	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
8. Routines of class and classroom management	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
9. Providing for individual differences	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
10. Group activities--large and small	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
11. Pupil-teacher relationships	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
12. Teacher-paraprofessional relationships	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
13. Teacher-principal relationships	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
14. School-community relations	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
15. Self-evaluation (strengths and weaknesses)	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9

11. Listed below are some techniques advocated for teacher training. In Part I, please indicate to what extent each approach was utilized by circling the appropriate number as follows:

1. means about once or more a week
2. means about twice a month
3. means about once a month
4. means about once every two months
5. means about once every three months
9. means not at all

In Part II please estimate how successful you found each of these techniques as follows:

1. means very successful
2. means quite successful
3. means moderately successful
4. means slightly successful
5. means not successful
9. means no basis for judging

	Part I	Part II
Technique	Utilization	Effectiveness
1. Demonstration lessons		
a. with the trainee's class	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
b. pre-planning with trainee	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
c. follow-up conference	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
2. Inter-visitation		
a. to experienced teachers	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
b. to other trainees	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
3. Observation of other teachers		
a. pre-planning before observation	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
b. follow-up conference with observed teacher	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
c. follow-up conference withour observed teacher	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
d. video-taped observations	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
4. Conferences		
a. individual	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
b. group	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
c. discuss common lesson observation with group trainees	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
5. Workshops		
a. develop instructional materials and techniques	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
b. plan and plan book organization	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
c. room and display materials	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
d. curriculum study	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
e. method and procedure	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9

12. Listed below are aspects of teaching about which teachers have differing attitudes.

In Column 1 please indicate your present feeling in each area as follows:

1. means "Completely Positive"
2. means "Generally Positive"
3. means "Neutral"
4. means "Generally Negative but Aware of Rewards"
5. means "Completely Negative"
9. means "Do Not Wish To Reply"

In Column 2 please indicate whether you are aware of a change in your attitude in this area during the past school year by circling the appropriate sign as follows:

+ means changed in a positive direction
- means changed in a negative direction
0 means no change

If you indicated a change by circling + or - in Column 2 please indicate in Column 3 the title of the person(s) or the experience most instrumental in bringing about this change.

Aspect	Column 1 Present Attitude	Column 2 Direction of Change	Column 3 Title of Person or Experience Responsible
1. Teaching in general	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	
2. Teaching in urban schools	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	
3. Working with students from low socio-economic backgrounds	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	
4. Working with students from middle socio-economic backgrounds	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	
5. Working with students from high socio-economic backgrounds	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	
6. Working with children who learn very quickly	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	
7. Working with children who learn slowly	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	
8. Working with children who have a physical style of learning	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	
9. Working with children with behavior problems	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	
10. Your feelings of self-confidence as a teacher	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	

IF YOU ARE A TRAINEE IN THE STINT PROGRAM PLEASE COMPLETE THE REMAINING QUESTIONS, OTHERWISE MOVE DIRECTLY TO THE FINAL ITEM, #24.

13. Consider the work of the teacher trainer assigned to this school in the following areas using this scale:

1. means poor
2. means fair
3. means good
4. means superior
5. means excellent
9. no basis for rating

1. Interpersonal relationships

a. _____ with supervisors
b. _____ with trainees
c. _____ with other teachers
d. _____ with parents
e. _____ with children
f. _____ with auxiliary personnel

2. Teaching ability

a. _____ classroom teaching
b. _____ classroom demonstration lessons
c. _____ teacher training workshops

3. Personal attributes

a. _____ energy
b. _____ alertness
c. _____ adaptability
d. _____ professional attitude
e. _____ appearance

4. Overall effectiveness _____

14. Do you think you are more effective in the classroom as a result of having worked with a STINT teacher trainer?

a. Definitely YES b. Probably YES c. NO d. Don't Know

15. Please explain the basis for your answer.

16. Do you consider yourself to be better able to deal with the learning and emotional problems that arise in a ghetto classroom than if you had not been a STINT trainee? (Circle answer)

a. Definitely YES   b. Probably YES   c. NO   d. Do Not Know

17. Please explain the basis for your answer.

18. How would you rate the morale of the STINT trainees as compared with that of other beginning teachers you know who are not receiving assistance from the STINT teacher trainer? (Circle appropriate number)

1. Much better morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
2. Somewhat better morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
3. About the same morale as non-STINT beginning teachers
4. Somewhat worse morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
5. Much worse morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
9. No basis for making this judgment

19. Overall, how effective was the STINT program in this school?

1. _____ Excellent
2. _____ Very Good
3. _____ Good
4. _____ Fair
5. _____ Poor
6. _____ Unsatisfactory
9. _____ No basis for judging beyond my own experiences

20. In your opinion, what are the major specific strengths of the STINT program?

21. In your opinion, what are the major specific weaknesses of the STINT program?

22. What recommendations would you suggest to improve the STINT program for next year?

23. Do you have any suggestions regarding evaluation of the program for this year, or for next year?

24. If you have any comments to make regarding STINT that you have not already reported in this questionnaire please do so now. (Use back of page if needed.)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION

If you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study, please tear off this portion and return under separate cover.

Name____

Address ______________________________________

____

Return to: STINT Evaluation

Center for Urban Education

Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE FORM B

GRADE________

District #________ School #________ Borough ________

We would like to reassure you that this questionnaire is strictly confidential and will be seen only by the project director and her immediate staff. Neither you, nor your school and district, will ever be identified in any of our reports.

1. Are you presently, or have you at some time during this school year worked with a STINT teacher trainer?

   a. Yes b. No

2. Which of the following licenses do you hold? (Circle all that apply)

   1. Early Childhood
   2. Common Branches
   3. Substitute
   4. Conditional Substitute
   5. Emergency Substitute
   6. Other ________________________

3. What type of teacher preparation did you have?

   1. Regular undergraduate teacher education program
   2. Regular graduate teacher education program
   3. Intensive (short-term) graduate teacher education program
   4. Professional courses necessary to qualify for substitute license (not a formal program)
   5. Other ________________________

4. Is this your first teaching assignment?

   a. Yes b. No

5. If NO, what other teaching experience have you had and for how long?

6. Please indicate the extent of supervision and/or assistance given to you by each of the persons listed below. Where some supervision and/or assistance occurred would you please indicate how helpful it was to you with respect to your effectiveness as a teacher, using the following scale:

1. means always provided constructive suggestions
2. means frequently provided constructive suggestions
3. means sometimes provided constructive suggestions
4. means commented on observed lesson
5. means no comments offered
8. I prefer not to respond
9. means does not apply

Extent of Supervision and/or Assistance (check)				Personnel	Quality of Supervision and/or Assistance (circle choice)
None	Once or twice since school began	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more		
				STINT Teacher Trainer	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				Grade Leader	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				"Buddy" Teacher	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				Guidance Counselor	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				O. T. P. i.e., Corrective Reading Tchr.	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				Experienced Teachers in School	1 2 3 4 5 8 9
				Other _______	1 2 3 4 5 8 9

7. To what extent has supportive service (assistance, etc.) been provided this past school year in the following areas? Please indicate the title of the person providing the most support in each area and indicate the nature of this service by circling the appropriate number as follows:

1. means provided continuous effective support
2. means provided continuous but ineffective support
3. means provided sporadic but effective support
4. means provided sporadic and ineffective support
5. means no support provided but would have been helpful
6. means no support provided and none needed

	Personnel	Rating				
a. Curriculum (General)						
Reading		1	2	3	4	5
Math		1	2	3	4	5
Social Studies		1	2	3	4	5
Science		1	2	3	4	5
Other		1	2	3	4	5
b. Methodology (General)						
Reading		1	2	3	4	5
Math		1	2	3	4	5
Social Studies		1	2	3	4	5
Science		1	2	3	4	5
c. Class Control (General)						
Room Management		1	2	3	4	5
Discipline		1	2	3	4	5

8. To what extent were you given on-the-job immediate help when and where it was needed by a member of the school staff?

a. Always
b. Usually
c. Sometimes
d. Never

9. If you received such assistance, what was the title of the person who provided the major portion of this help?

____

10. Listed below are some areas of concern to teachers. In Column 1 please estimate your current competency in each aspect as follows:

1. means "Excellent"
2. means "Good"
3. means "Fair"
4. means "Poor"
5. means "Totally Unsatisfactory"
9. means "Does Not Apply"

If you were a STINT trainee, in Column 2 please indicate the extent you attribute your current competence in this area to the teacher trainer as follows:

1. means "Completely"
2. means "Considerably"
3. means "Moderately"
4. means "Slightly"
5. means "Not At All"
9. means "Does Not Apply"

ASPECT	Column 1 Self Appraisal	Column 2 Influence of Traine
1. General methods of teaching	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
2. Methods of teaching reading	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
3. Methods of teaching math	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
4. Development of instructional materials	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
5. New educational media, i.e. programmed instruction	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
6. Expectations of pupil achievement	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
7. Questioning techniques	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
8. Discipline in the classroom	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
9. Clerical tasks, i.e. Roll Books	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
10. Providing for the exceptional child	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
11. Special services in the school, i.e. guidance	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
12. Parent-teacher relationships	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
13. Teacher-co-worker relationships	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
14. Teacher (trainee)-teacher-trainer relationships	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
15. Professional relations, i.e. organizations	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9

11. Listed below are some techniques advocated for teacher training. In Part I please indicate to what extent each approach was utilized by circling the appropriate number as follows:

1. means about once or more a week
2. means about twice a month
3. means about once a month
4. means about once every two months
5. means about once every three months
9. means not at all

In Part II please estimate how successful you found each of these techniques as follows:

1. means very successful
2. means quite successful
3. means moderately successful
4. means slightly successful
5. means not successful
9. means no basis for judging

Technique	Part I Utilization	Part II Effectiveness
1. Grade Conferences		
a. curriculum material	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
b. with supervisors	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
c. goals and expectations	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
2. Curriculum area study		
a. curriculum coordinators	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
b. consultants and specialists	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
c. materials for the curriculum area	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
3. Micro-teaching		
a. methods and materials	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
b. skills and techniques	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
c. whole class	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
d. small group	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
4. Planning		
a. individual	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
b. cooperative in pairs and by group	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
c. planning for individual children	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
5. Use of instructional equipment (audio-visual, flannel boards, realia, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
6. Use of films and tapes of lessons for analysis and discussion	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9
7. Conferences in self-evaluation by trainees	1 2 3 4 5 9	1 2 3 4 5 9

12. Listed below are aspects of teaching about which teachers have differing attitudes.

In Column 1 please indicate your present feeling in each area as follows:

1. means "Completely Positive"
2. means "Generally Positive"
3. means "Neutral"
4. means "Generally Negative but Aware of Rewards"
5. means "Completely Negative"
9. means "Do Not Wish To Reply"

In Column 2 please indicate whether you are aware of a change in your attitude in this area during the past school year by circling the appropriate sign as follows:

+ means changed in a positive direction
- means changed in a negative direction
0 means no change

If you indicated a change by circling + or - in Column 2 please indicate in Column 3 the title of the person(s) or the experience most instrumental in bringing about this change.

Aspect	Column 1 Present Attitude	Column 2 Direction of Change	Column 3 Title of Person or Experience Responsible
1. Teaching in general	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	______________
2. Teaching in urban schools	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	______________
3. Working with students from low socio-economic backgrounds	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	______________
4. Working with students from middle socio-economic backgrounds	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	______________
5. Working with students from high socio-economic backgrounds	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	______________
6. Working with children who learn very quickly	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	______________
7. Working with children who learn slowly	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	______________
8. Working with children who have a physical style of learning	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	______________
9. Working with children with behavior problems	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	______________
10. Your feelings of self-confidence as a teacher	1 2 3 4 5 8	+ 0 -	______________

IF YOU ARE A TRAINEE IN THE STINT PROGRAM PLEASE COMPLETE THE REMAINING QUESTIONS, OTHERWISE MOVE DIRECTLY TO THE FINAL ITEM, #24.

13. Consider the work of the teacher trainer assigned to this school in the following areas using this scale:

1. means poor
2. means fair
3. means good
4. means superior
5. means excellent
9. no basis for rating

1. Interpersonal relationships

    a. _____ with supervisors
    b. _____ with trainees
    c. _____ with other teachers
    d. _____ with parents
    e. _____ with children
    f. _____ with auxiliary personnel

2. Teaching ability

    a. _____ classroom teaching
    b. _____ classroom demonstration lessons
    c. _____ teacher training workshops

3. Personal attributes

    a. _____ energy
    b. _____ alertness
    c. _____ adaptability
    d. _____ professional attitude
    e. _____ appearance

4. Overall effectiveness _____

14. Do you think you are more effective in the classroom as a result of having worked with a STINT teacher trainer?

a. Definitely YES   b. Probably YES   c. NO   d. Don't Know

15. Please explain the basis for your answer.

16. Do you consider yourself to be better able to deal with the learning and emotional problems that arise in a ghetto classroom than if you had not been a STINT trainee? (Circle answer)

a. Definitely YES b. Probably YES c. NO d. Do Not Know

17. Please explain the basis for your answer.

18. How would you rate the morale of the STINT trainees as compared with that of other beginning teachers you know who are not receiving assistance from the STINT teacher trainer? (Circle appropriate number)

1. Much better morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
2. Somewhat better morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
3. About the same morale as non-STINT beginning teachers
4. Somewhat worse morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
5. Much worse morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
9. No basis for making this judgment

19. Overall, how effective was the STINT program in this school?

1. _____ Excellent
2. _____ Very Good
3. _____ Good
4. _____ Fair
5. _____ Poor
6. _____ Unsatisfactory
9. _____ No basis for judging beyond my own experiences

20. In your opinion, what are the major specific strengths of the STINT program?

21. In your opinion, what are the major specific weaknesses of the STINT program?

22. What recommendations would you suggest to improve the STINT program for next year?

23. Do you have any suggestions regarding evaluation of the program for this year, or for next year?

24. If you have any comments to make regarding STINT that you have not already reported in this questionnaire please do so now. (Use back of page if needed.)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION

- -

If you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study, please tear off this portion and return under separate cover.

Name____

Address ______________________________________

____

Return to: STINT Evaluation

B41

Board of Education of the City of New York

Office of Personnel
Division of Recruitment, Training and Development
65 Court Street - Room 708
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers (STINT)

GUIDELINES FOR THE TEACHER TRAINER

Reprinted by permission of Mr. Isidore Rosenman, Director, Teacher Training Program, Office of Personnel, Board of Education of the City of New York.

SELECTION OF TEACHER TRAINERS

1. Teacher trainer must have had a minimum of five years of successful teaching.

2. Teacher trainer must have demonstrated success in the teaching of reading.

3. Teacher trainer must have had teaching experience with children of varied abilities.

4. Teacher trainer must be one who is considered to be a "master teacher" by supervisors and peers.

5. Teacher trainer must be one who can communicate his skills to other teachers.

6. Teacher trainers should be selected from all levels of the elementary school: early childhood, middle grades, upper grades.

7. Teacher trainers should have demonstrated good inter-personal relationships with children, parents, teachers and supervisors.

8. Teacher trainers should have demonstrated leadership as in assignment as acting assistant principal, head teacher in Head Start, grade leader, etc.

9. Teacher trainers are to be recommended in writing by principals and superintendents.

ALLOCATION OF POSITIONS

1. Teacher trainers should be assigned in schools with greatest numbers of newly appointed and inexperienced teachers.

2. Teacher trainers should be assigned in schools where the rate of teacher turnover is greatest.

3. Teacher trainers should be assigned in schools where achievement scores have been low.

4. Teacher trainers should be assigned on a programmed and full day basis in each school; avoid time consuming travel between schools.

5. Teacher trainers assigned in more than one school, should be assigned to schools in close proximity to each other.

6. Teacher trainers should be assigned to a maximum load of 9 teachers.

7. Teacher trainers should be assigned to a program of 18 periods in direct teacher training, 11 periods in workshops and conferences, group and individual, 1 supervisor conference period, five prep. periods. Program should be planned and structured in each assigned school.

8. Teacher trainer program should be in as few grades as possible.

9. Priority in assignment of teacher trainer should be given to teachers on first year of service with 2nd and 3rd year probationary teachers next in order.

10. Assignment, program, emphasis in work of teacher trainers should be based on the judgment of the principal of the school to which the trainer is assigned.

11. Assignment of teacher trainers should be continuous with the same teachers. Every effort should be made to avoid fragmentation or "hit and run" in assignments.

12. A follow up program is recommended.

TRAINING THE TEACHER TRAINER

1. There should be a pre-assignment training program for trainers to orient them and train them in procedures. This program should be for one week as a minimum.

2. There should be an ongoing training program for trainers for duration of assignment. This should be one session per month in first semester and two sessions in second semester. This can be done by releasing trainers from afternoon duties once a month or by providing additional compensation for afternoon or Saturday meetings.

3. There should be cooperative pre-planning of the program with the teacher trainers.

4. The program of training should employ evaluations of previous programs.

5. The program of training should study the problems of beginning and inexperienced teachers.

6. The training program should include the development of guidelines for teacher trainers in the form of bulletins in specified areas.

7. The training program should focus sharply on the job analysis of the teacher trainer assignment.

8. Training of teacher trainers should include new procedures, patterns and methodology of support for beginning teachers, and new technology to promote teacher effectiveness.

9. There should be ongoing evaluation of the program of teacher training with resulting recommended change.

ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

1. Teacher trainers will be under the direct supervision of their building principals. They will not be given building assignments or administrative duties which do not relate directly to teacher training.

2. A central coordinator is to be assigned for the teacher trainer program.

3. Assignment of teacher trainers is to be decentralized.

4. Guidelines for administration and supervision are to be centrally coordinated.

5. Central coordinator is to be responsible for development of guidelines for supervision.

6. Supervision is to be continuous - decentralized in district and by school supervisors under guidelines.

7. Supervision and administration are to be based on an emphasis on development of positive inter-personal relationships.

8. Supervision and administration will emphasize interchange of ideas and thinking.

9. Interchange of ideas and thinking with university personnel is to be encouraged.

10. Administration will plan evaluation and early assignment to evaluation agency for development of criteria and instruments.

11. The teacher trainer may be reassigned with his consent at any time during the school year. He may request reassignment or return to his old school at the end of any term.

12. Any teacher trainer whose work as a teacher trainer is considered by the principal to be less than satisfactory must be notified to this effect by the principal, and may then be reassigned to his old school by the district superintendent.

JOB ANALYSIS OF THE TEACHER TRAINER

1. The teacher trainer is to provide necessary and effective support for beginning and inexperienced teachers serving in the schools.

2. The teacher trainer will supplement the ongoing teacher training program in the school.

3. The teacher trainer will serve full time in the assignment of training and support of beginning and inexperienced teachers.

4. The school day of the teacher trainer will be divided approximately as follows:

    a) Direct work with teachers in their classrooms: 18 periods
    b) Workshop and conference periods with teachers: 11 periods
    c) Conference period with supervisors: 1 period
    d) Prep periods: 5 periods

5. The teacher trainer will focus the training program on the problems of beginning and inexperienced teachers, namely:

    a) Development of discipline in the classroom
    b) Planning - lesson, daily, weekly, unit, term
    c) The routines of the class and classroom
    d) Class management
    e) Relationships with parents
    f) Pupil adjustment - the exceptional pupil - meeting the different needs of individual children.
    g) General teaching method - the development of skill in teaching
    h) Group activities - large and small
    i) Development of instructional materials - use in the lesson
    j) Organization of the classroom for instruction - making the classroom inviting
    k) Self-evaluation - strength and weakness

6. The teacher trainer will develop cooperative pre-planning with beginning and inexperienced teachers.

7. The teacher trainer will participate actively in the teaching process with the trainee.

8. The teacher trainer will ascertain needs of individual teachers through observation and through conferences with teachers and supervisors.

9. The teacher trainer will plan training activities to meet the needs of individual teachers.

10. The teacher trainer will place strong emphasis on the development of positive inter-personal relationships with teachers and supervisors.

11. The teacher trainer will work closely with supervisors of trainees in order to insure support and continuity of training.

12. The teacher trainer will keep a log of activities and techniques employed with each trainee assigned.

TECHNIQUES IN THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS

The teacher trainer will utilize the following techniques and activities in the training program:

1. Demonstration lessons with the trainee's class - pre-planning with the trainee (how a lesson is planned) - conference should follow the demonstration lesson.

2. Inter-visitation: to experienced teachers; to other trainees; to class taught by other teacher trainers.

3. Observation of other teachers - pre-planning before observation - conference following observation - with observed teacher - without observed teacher. Video-tapes.

4. Conferences - individual - group - use of composite observation as basis of group conference among trainer and several trainees.

5. Workshops - develop instructional materials and techniques - plan and plan book organization - room and display materials - curriculum study - method and procedure.

6. Grade conferences - curriculum material - with supervisors - goals and expectancies.

7. Curriculum area study - curriculum coordinators, consultants and specialists - materials for the curriculum areas.

8. Micro teaching - methods and materials - skills for parts of lessons - techniques in phases of lessons - whole class and small group.

9. Planning - individual - cooperative in pairs and by group - composite plans for several trainees - planning directly with trainee for next lesson, next day, next week - demonstration by trainer in trainee's class of jointly planned lesson - planning for individual children.

10. Use of classroom teaching equipment - audio-visual - materials; flannel boards, number frames, realia, tapes, etc.

11. Use of films and tapes of lessons for analysis and discussion.

12. Conferences in self evaluation by trainees.

* *

Further guidelines and bulletins will be developed in all of the above activities and techniques.

PATTERNS OF ASSIGNMENT

The following patterns are some suggested ways of assigning the teacher trainer.

While the teacher trainer should only have 9 teachers at one time to train, it is conceivable that during the course of the school year he may drop some teachers from his program and pick up others. In this way, he may be able to train more than 9 teachers during the school year.

His program should also be flexible enough to allow him to perhaps spend a full day or part of the day with a particularly weak teacher.

The best pattern would be one teacher trainer to one school:

1 Tr. Trainer to 1 School (Sample Program)

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
9:00 - 9:40	Tchr. A	Tchr. E	Conf.	Tchr. I	Conf.
9:45 -10:25	Tchr. B	Tchr. F	Tchr. D	Tchr. H	Prep.
10:30-11:10	Tchr. C	Tchr. G	Tchr. B	Tchr. E	Work-shop
11:15-11:55	Conf.	Conf.	Conf.	Conf.	Conf.
11:55-12:50	L	U	N	C	H
1:00 - 1:40	Tchr. D	Tchr. H	Tchr. A	Tchr. F	Conf.
1:45 - 2:25	Conf.	Tchr. I	Tchr. C	Tchr. G	Conf. with supvrs.
2:25 - 3:00	Prep.	Prep.	Workshop	Prep.	Prep.

9 teachers
18 training periods
5 prep. periods
2 workshop periods) these may be arranged flexibly as needed
9 conf. periods)
1 conf. with supervisor

1 Tr. Trainer to 2 Schools (Sample Program)

	Monday School 1	Tuesday School 11	Wednesday	Thursday School 1	Friday School 11
9:00 - 9:40	Tchr. X	Tchr. A	Conf.	Tchr. W.	Tchr. C
9:45 -10:25	Tchr. Y	Tchr. B	Conf.	Tchr. V	Tchr. D
10:30-11:10	Tchr. Z	Tchr. C	Conf.	Tchr. X	Tchr. A
11:15-11:55	Prep.	Conf.	Prep.	Prep.	Conf.
11:55-12:50	L	U	N	C	H
1:00 - 1:40	Tchr. W	Tchr. D	Conf.	Tchr. Z	Tchr. B
1:45 - 2:25	Tchr. V	Prep.	Conf. I with supv.	Tchr. Y	Prep.
2:25-3:00	Conf.	Workshop	Conf. II with supv.	Workshop	Conf.

9 teachers - 5 in school 1, 4 in school 11
18 training periods
5 prep. periods
8 conf. periods - divided between two school) These may be arranged
2 workshop periods - one in each school) flexibly as needed.
2 conf. periods with supervisors of schools - divided between two schools.